13

SUPERSTITIO SVPERSTES:

OR,

THE RELIQUES OF SVPERSTITION

newly Revived.

Manifested in a Discourse concerning the *Holineſſe of Churches*, And *bowing* towards the ALTAR.

Whereunto is added a Cenſure of two Letters, touching the ſame Subject,

By D. C.

Aquin. 22. q. 97. ar. 4. c.

Superſtitio eſt quadam proteſtatio infidelitatis.

Senec. Epiſt. 123.

Superſtitio error inſanus eſt, amandos timet, quos colit, violat. Quid enim intereſt, utrum Deos neges, an inſanies?

LONDON:
Printed by *A. N.* for *I. M.*
1641.

SUPERSTITIO

SVPERSTES:

OR

THE RECOURSE OF

SVPERSTITION

newly Revived.

Manifested in a Discourse concerning the *Manifest of Charities*, And bearing towards

the ATTAR.

Whereunto is added a Censure of two Letters,

By D. C.

Aquin. 22. q. 97. ar. 4. c.

Superstitio est quaedam protestatio in fidelitatis.

Sanc. Epist. 123.

Superstitio ergo in sugus est, arrendus timet, quos colit, vidit. Quid ita interest, utrum Deos neges, an insanes?

LONDON:

Printed by *A. N.* for *I. M.*

1641.

To the truly Religious Reader.

WHether Religion be a Vertue, or the Mother, and bond of all vertues, I will not now dispute. This I am sure of, that it happens to it, as unto Divine and Morall vertues, to be attended with two extreames, the one on the left hand, the other on the right; the one called Prophanenesse, the other Superstition: the one whereof is the defect, the other the excesse of Religion. That both of these are enemies to Religion, and odious to God, there is no question; but whether most, is yet uncertaine, which we shall then resolve, when we have manifested these three things, 1. What Superstition is. 2. How common. 3. How great a sin it is.

For the first; Superstition, in the generall, is nothing else but the excesse of Religion, or rather Religion run out of the wits, q.d. by a superstitious and slavish feare of the Deitie. Hence it is fitly by the Greekes, called δεισιδαιμονία, Act. 25.19 a feare of the Deitie; And of the Athenians (otherwise prophane enough) the Apostle sayes, he did perceive them to be δεισιδαιμονεστέρους, too superstitious, too fearefull of the Dæmons, whom they ignorantly did worship, Act. 17.22. For the conscience of such men being terrified by its owne guiltinesse and prophanenesse, puts them upon such wayes to please their God, and make him propitious, as best would please themselves, were they in his steed. And from hence proceeds that ἐθελοθρησκία, as it is called Col. 2.23. that will-worship, whereby men take upon them to prescribe to God, how he shall be served; every man according to his owne fancie, and imagination of God. From whence it doth appeare, that superstition is a sin against the second Commandement, and is rather a species of Idolatry, than the Genus of it, as the great Schooleman seemes to make it: For Idolatry is two wayes committed, either by worshipping a false God, or the true God in a false manner: The first of these is prohibited in the first Commandement, the other in the second; The first was the sinne of the Gentiles, the other was the sinne of the Israelites, in the time of Jeroboam, who worshipped the true God, in the Image of a golden Calfe; and the sinne of all those who worship God, with the inventions and traditions of men. Now when I say, that Superstition is the excesse of Religion, we may not so take it, as if a man could properly be too religious, or give God more than is due to him, or he deserves: but in that a man gives that to God as part of worship, which he doth not require, which is indeed to give him lesse. For the affirmative part of the fourth Commandement being this, That God must bee worshipped with his

1. W
perst
Super
superf
superf
1. ca
supra
Minsh

Aqui
92. ar.

Ibid. a

owne prescribed worship; hee that shall now devise a way of worship of his owne, and tender this to God, to make him propitious (fearing that that is prescribed, will not doe it sufficiently) this is that which stiles him superstitious. And this is that we call Superstition.

For the second thing propounded, How common a sin this Superstition is, as it doth appeare by instances of all times and places; So also by the frequent and strict prohibitions given against it. The second Commandement is therefore propounded negatively, to imply, that men are apter to adde, (which is Superstition, as we said) than to detract from the prescribed Rules of worship (which is prophaneneſſe.) Certaine it is indeed, that Prophanneſſe and Superstition have almost divided the world betweene them (there being few that find, or keepe the golden Meane of Religion) but whether of them hath the greater share is yet uncertaine. The difficulty of deciding this doubt, is thus augmented; That the same parties (being not truly Religious) are oftentimes both prophane and superstitious. Prophane without, in common life, and superstitious within the Church, when they come to tender their devotions. Nay the Scripture gives us instances enough, and too many of these kind of men, who were most notoriously prophane and wicked, and yet exceeded in their formalities, and ceremoniall services of God, Isa. 1. Jer. 7. Psal. 50. &c. And howsoever prophanneſſe in the very worship of God bee a common vice, and men be too propense unto it; yet, if I mistake not, men are more inclined to be superstitious in their worship, than prophane, and that for these reasons.

First, Atheisme, which is the Mother of prophanneſſe, is not so common; few there be that say, There is no God; or if they say it, that really beleeve it. For this is a naturall principle surviving the Fall of man, [That there is a God] upon which depends this next conclusion, [That this God must be worshipped] and that with Reverence; But there is no light left in man, How God will be worshipped, at least for the externall part; whereas there are some reliques of moralitie left, to keepe men from extreme prophanneſſe. Hereupon it comes to passe, that men are apt to thinke, that God is like themselves, to be pleased best, with free-will-offerings of their owne, that is, with will-worship, and voluntarie Humilitie, Col. 2. 18. and that the highest, or rather the loweſt expreſſions of Devotion are fittest for him: And thus (wanting light) they find out many inventions, to serve God withall, which is nothing else but Superstition.

Secondly, because men are naturally prond, and conceited of their owne wisedome, even to prescribe in the service of God. Hence wee may observe, that when the Apostle speakes of Will-worship and Superstition, he commonly intimates the cause and originall thereof, to bee the φρόνημα, the wisedome of the flesh. That Humilitie, or demission of mind, that was pleaded for worshipping of Angels, using them as Mediators to God, Col. 2. 18. was the

devise

deuise of some, [That were vainly puffed up in their fleshly mind.] *And so in the following verses, those Traditions,* [Touch not, taste not, handle not] *had the same originall* [which things have a shew of wisedome, &c.] *The like is to be observed,* Rom. 1. 22. 23. *The Gentiles when they changed the glory of God, into Images of all sorts, thought themselves very wise: for so hee sayes,* [professing themselves wise, they became fooles.] *The Israelites also, when they chose them places, and trees to worship God in, and under them (contrary to expresse command of God) wanted not pretence of reason for what they did,* Hos. 4. 13. [They Sacrifise upon the tops of the Mountaines, and burne Incense upon the Hills, under the Oake, the Poplar tree, and the Elme, because the shadow thereof is good, &c.] *Good in regard of Divine presence, more there than else-where: Good in regard of more Holinesse, as consecrated to such a Deitie: Good lastly, to stirre up more devotion, for the former reasons, viz. the consideration of Divine presence, and more Holinesse there than in other places. Now, this proud conceited wisedome, keepes men so farre from being prophane in the service of God, that it rather precipitates them into the other extreme, and that is* Superstition.

Thirdly, that men may Supererogate *with God, is a naturall piece of Peperie, borne and bred up in the hearts of all men; by which men thinke either to merit of God, if lesse grossely vitious, or at least, to set off with him, and to quit the score of former arreares, by voluntary and uncommanded services. If they find they faile and come short in some thing commanded, they will overdoe, in some other thing not commanded, and so they take it, that God is satisfied. Now to foster and favour this opinion, the performance of required services will not serve the turne. For no man can dreame to merit reward, or satisfie a debt, by a necessary and enjoyned performance; Therefore, that he may supererogate in both, hee must deuise and undertake something not commanded. Hence were and are, those counsels of perfection, of the old Papists, the Pharisees; and the New Pharisees, the Papists: Wee heare one of them bragging; I thanke God, I pay Tithes of all I doe possesse, that was but his dutie: but more than that, I fast twice a weeke, which God never required of him: implying, that either God was beholden to him, or at least, he was not beholden to God, or any wayes behind-hand with him, though he had failed in other things; for in doing more than was commanded, he had made amends for what he had offended. Of this mind it seemes were their Predecessors,* Isay 58. *who durst expostulate with God, as not observing their devotions:* [Wherefore have we fasted, and thou regardest it not?] *They could not be so senselesse, as not to see and know themselves to be faultie enough, (as God charges them presently upon it) but had they not thought, the satisfaction made by Fasting more than was required, they had not made*

that bold and saweie expostulation with God. It is the naturall fashion of hypocrites, to ply God with ceremonials, for neglect of morals; and to make amends (as they thinke) for breach of Gods commands, by substitution of their owne superstitious Traditions. And in this notion wee may say, that superstition springs from the ground of prophaneneſſe: none commonly being more ceremonious (that is superstitious) than they that are most prophane. For knowing themselves indebted for morall transgressions, they labour to compensate God with Ceremonials, either of his commanding, or of their own devising. Guiltineſſe (as I said) drives them to doe something to appease an angry, and by prophanneſſe provoked God; Duties commanded by God, when best performed, are but duties, and therefore pay no former debts: Onely Counsels of perfection, or devises of higher Devotion, seeme to supererrogate, and this is Superstition.

Fourthly, because there is more credit and applause from men, not onely more than can be looked for, in prophanneſſe (which is lyable to dishonour, and just hatred) but more than can be gotten, by doing things commanded. To doe duties commanded by God, (at least for the outward act) is vulgar, and common to every Professour of Religion: but hee that transcends commands, and worships God, with voluntary worship, with greatest humilitie, and abjection of himselfe, this is the Saint of hypocrites, and the Angell of ignorant men. This is easily observable, that those that were exactest in ceremonials (whether Gods, or their owne, but rather their owne) though guilty often in morals, carryed away the credit of the world from them that were more exact in morals, and equally exact in Ceremonials of Gods prescribing. Zacharie and Eliz. that walked in all the Commandements, Ordinances and statutes of the Lord without rebuke, were not in halfe that reputation, that the Pharisees were, who did exceed in observation of their owne Traditions. Nay, our blessed Saviour himselfe, though most exact in all commands of God, could not winne so much credit and applause as the Pharisees had in those times. And the Pharisees had no better way (as they thought) to suppresse the growing fame of him and his Disciples, than to lay upon them this imputation of want of Devotion, in not observing the Traditions of the Elders.

Fiftly, because as Ceremonials are easier to doe than morals, so those Ceremonials which themselves invented, they can more easily, and more exactly performe, than those of Gods prescribing. How easie a thing it was, to Sacrifice a beast, how hard to mortifie a lust? How easie a thing it was to wash their hands, and pots, and cups, and dishes; How hard to wash their hearts from rapine and extortion? How easie a thing it is to bow the body with severall Postures and gesticulations, how hard to bend the soule to Gods commands? Now the truth is, Superstition, though it seeme a busie,

yet

yet it is but a lazie thing. Like some lither and idle servants, who are very quick about lesser matters, but remisse enough in businesses of greater waight or labour. Nay, therefore double diligent in lesser, that they may exempt themselves from harder works: Just so it is, with Superstitious hypocrites, they sometimes tire themselves, and weary God, with ritualls, that they may slip their necks from harder services. Besides, there is another thing in it. Their owne Devises, they can, and know they can, exactly performe; but things of Gods prescription, are very hard, if not for matter, yet for manner to be performed. Hence they find just cause to be humbled in their best performances of Gods commands, as failing and falling short of what was commanded, but they find cause to applaud themselves, and to glory in their owne devised services, because they have exactly performed them.

Lastly, because the most wicked and profane, desire not so to seeme, but find out figg-leaves to cover their profanenesse. Herod, *though he intended murder, pretended worship unto Christ.* Iezabel *that meant to swallow down* Naboths *Vineyard, proclames a Fast. The Pharisees that devoured widowes houses, did it with a pretence of long prayers. Now the more seemingly devout men are at Church, the lesse they are suspected to be wicked at home, or abroad. Who would imagine to finde a widowes house, in the bowells of a long praying Pharisee? or to meet with rapine and extortion, in a washed and scoured dish? Who would think, that a man that bowes constantly, devoutly, at the Name of Jesus, would commonly sweare by the name of God, or Christ? Who would looke to find those, that bowe so much, so oft before the Altar, so stiffe to yeeld obedience to the morall cõmands of God? In a word, to find men, who are religious even to Superstition, to be profane even to Admiration? Upon all these reasons, and perhaps more, it may appeare, that men are more enclin'd to Superstition, than to profanenesse; and consequently, that profanenesse is not so common, as Superstition.*

And now wee come to the third, How great a sinne Superstition is; For How gr sinne S stition *though it be true, that* profanenesse *is an odious sinne, and so esteemed by men; yet sure it is, that* Superstition *is most abominable to God, notwithstanding those many specious* pretences *that it hath, of singular and speciall* Devotion; *which we shall thus demonstrate.*

First, it derogates from the infinite wisedom of God, as if he were not wise enough to prescribe his own worship: we said before, that Superstition *wants not shewes of wisedom, to make it plausible with men, and (as they thinke) well pleasing to God: Now for foolish man, to make himselfe wiser than God, in matter of his owne worship, as it proceeds from intollerable pride and presumption, so it cannot choose but be abominable to God. No King, no Father, no Master on earth, would suffer such insolence from their inferiours, that they shou'd take upon them to prescribe their manner of service; and shall God?*

Secondly, it detracts not onely from the perfection and truth of Scripture, by addition to the Rule of worship, but it belyes both the Scripture, and God himselfe, making that his command, and a part of worship, which is the figment and device of man. The false Prophets were of old charged with forgerie, for saying, Thus saith the Lord when the Lord hath not spoken it. And of Ephraim, *who was superstitious in the service of God, thus it is said,* [Ephraim compasses me about with lyes, *Hos.* 12.1.] *To this purpose is that of* Solomon. *Pro.* 30. 6. [Add not thou unto his words, lest hee reprove them, and thou be found a lyar.] *for putting that upon God, as if it were his word, which is thine own invention. As not to beleeve what God testifies, is to make him a lyar,* 1 Ioh. 5. 10. *So to make him say, what he sayes not, is also to put upon him a lye. Now we know how haynous a crime it is, to give the lye to a man, at least our Superiour: How great a sinne then is it to put the lye upon the God of truth?*

Thirdly, whereas men pretend they doe it out of their great respects and love of God, as thinking nothing too deare, too much for God; the truth is, it proceeds from hatred of God: This is evident in the second commandement, where those that keepe Gods Commandements, that is, his prescriptions of worship, according to the second commandement, are said to love him, and keepe his commandements. And on the contrary, they that break his commandements, either by defect, or by additions of their owne, are said to hate him: [Visiting the sinnes, &c. upon them that hate me:] *Now there is nothing more odious, to God or men, than hatred masked under the pretences of love.*

Fourthly, it is Idolatry, not onely against the second commandement, worshipping God in a false manner, but even against the first commandement, either negatively, not having the true God for our God; or positively, setting up another God, in his steed. First, the first commandement requires, not onely that we have no other God, but also, that wee have the true God for our God. But hee that worships God in a false manner, hath not the true God for his God, nor doth he worship him. This is evident in 2 King. 17. 32. 34. *In the one verse it is said; They feared or served the Lord, that is, they intended so to doe; but in the other, it is said, They feared not the Lord; and the reason is rendred, because they did not serve him according to the Law, and commandement, which the Lord commanded the sonnes of* Iacob, *&c. For the other, that the Superstitious worshipper, sets up another God, in the steed of the true God, will thus appeare; because he sets up himselfe in the steed of God; and in serving God, hee serves himselfe. This is easily collected from that speech of God himselfe,* Zach 7.5. [When you fasted and mourned, in the fifth and seventh moneth, as now these seventy yeares; did you fast at all to me, I say, to me? when you eat and drank, did you not eat to your selves and drink to your selves?] *As if he should say, you fasted to*

your

your selves, as well as you did eat and drink to your selves. Those Fasts I required not, you devised them of your owne heads, and observed them, as your owne Traditions, and so in worshipping me, you worshipped your selves. And this was in effect, to set up your selves as God. As if a Subject or Servant shall prescribe Lawes, how they will serve their King or Master; is not this to set up themselves, insteed of their King and Master? So doe all superstitious persons; they pull downe God out of his Throne, and place themselves therein, and under pretence of worshipping God, they worship themselves, which is most grosse Idolatry, against the first commandement.

Lastly, it is the worst and highest degree of Idolatry, not onely the worshipping of an Idoll, but it is the worshipping of the Devill, Gods greatest enemie, insteed of God, placing him in the Throne of God. This is evident by the Scriptures; in many instances. The Gentiles first, intended no doubt to offer sacrifices to the true God, Rom. 1. 21. Act. 17. 23. *Yet the Apostle sayes expresly,* 1 Cor. 10. 20. *The things which the Gentiles offer, they offer to Devils and not to God.* Aaron *and the Israelites, intended also to worship the true God,* Exod. 32. 5. *These be thy Gods, O* Israel, *which brought thee out of Egypt: Yet* Levit. 17. 7. *they are forbidden to sacrifise any more (as they had done) to Devils. The* 10 *Tribes had the same good intentions,* 1 King. 12. 28. *Yet* 2 Chron. 11. 15. *It is said of* Ieroboam. [He ordained him Priests — for the Devils, and for the calves which he made.] *Because they worshipped the true God, in a false manner, therefore they are said to worship the Devill insteed of God. In a word, The Papists, that worship God, in Images of gold, silver, brasse, stone, and wood, &c. suppose that they worship the true God; but S.* John *sayes, they worship Devils.* Rev. 9. 20. *By all which hath bin said, it now appeares, that however* Superstition *makes a faire shew of honouring God, and is of high esteeme with men; yet it is an hainous sinne, and most justly, for the former reasons, most abominable to God.*

To apply this a little to our present purpose. This Age of ours is profane enough, there is no question to be made of that. It cannot also be denyed, but profaneneſſe *began to creepe apace upon the service of God; But I dare say, that* Superstition, *like a gangrene, hath crept further in a few yeares, than* profaneneſſe *did in many, and had it not beene maturely checked, it might, for ought I know, by this time have carried us neere to* Rome. *Amongst other particulars, wherein* Superstition *began to revive, some are here presented to thy view (good Reader) as leaders of the rest. Apparent it is, that some men began to put so much* holineſſe *in Churches, and things thereto belonging, that they had almost lost all* holineſſe *in themselves: and the* holineſſe *of* places *had wellnigh eat up all the* holineſſe *of* Times, *unleſſe they were* Times *of mens devising. For first, is it not evident, that the* Holy dayes *so called, had thrust out almost the* holineſſe *of the* Lords Day, *or gotten to themselves*

equall

equall honour with it? The Holy dayes of Saints were as strictly presſed to be obſerved, and by themſelves obſerved, with more devotion, with more ſolemne ſervices, than the Lords Day; On them men might not work, in their honeſt callings, but preſently they were preſented; On this, (the Lords Day) they gave them liberty, without ſinne, not only to labour, but to play, and that ſuch playes, as ſcarce beſeeme a common, much leſſe, an Holy day. *For the* places *alſo of humane conſecration, how* ſacred *and holy were they eſteemed, not onely in their publick uſe, but* extra uſum. *No veſſell, no burden, might paſſe through them, no buſineſſe ſecular might be done in them; whereas the* Lords Day *was counted* holy; *no longer than the* publick Service *laſted. From the* Altar *to the* Bell-ropes, *all were Sacred; no comming in to the Church, no going out, without uncovering, adoration, proſtration, once, twice, thrice, forward, backward; and he that would not doe ſo, was held, little better than profane. The very* Churchyards *were growne ſo holy, that if a* beaſt *did but touch them, they were held by ſome profaned. Hence thoſe* Holy Articles, *given to enquire, whether any kinde of cattell were ſuffered to feed therein. Such is the ſpreading nature of* Superſtition, *that though the* Churchyard *bounds be known, yet* Superſtition *once gotten into the Church, knowes no limits. I will make bold to borrow the words of another, altering onely the Subject whereof he ſpake, to this in hand, and adding ſome few words beſides.* [Of the two great enemies of Gods holy worſhip, although *profaneneſſe*, in it ſelfe, be the more offenſive; yet *Superſtition* is more ſpreading, and more quick of growth. In ſuch a Church as this, ſo ſetled, in a conſtant practiſe of Religious offices, and ſo confirmed by godly *Canons*, for the performance of the ſame there was no feare, that ever the publick worſhip of God would have beene over-runne by the profane neglect of any pious reverence, then required. Rather the danger was, leſt by the violent torrent of ſome mens affections, it might have be ne overflowne by thoſe Superſtitions, wherewith, in imitation of the Iewes, (or Papiſts) they began to charge it: and thereby made it, as burdenſome to their brethren, as was the ceremoniall Law to the Iſraelites, by the Law of *Moſes*.' Nor know wee, where they would have ſtayed, had not the Honourable Parliament now aſſembled, been pleaſed, out of a tender care of the worſhip of God, and ſafety of Religion, to give a check to their proceedings.] *But I may not enlarge my Epiſtle too farre, leſt my Perch grow too bigg for my houſe. I leave what ever hath, or ſhall be ſaid, to the candide cenſure of the godly and judicious Reader. Farewell.*

f Sab.
cd.

SUPERSTITIO SVPERSTES. OR The Reliques of Superstition newly Revived.

CHAP. I.

Concerning the Holinesse *of* Churches.

THere hath beene of late, amongst our selves, a Controversie revived, concerning the *Holinesse* of Places, now in the times of the *Gospell*; [*Whether any Place bee properly Holy, or more holy than another.*] In particular, *Whether the Church be more holy than other Places, or one part of the Church more holy than another.* This Question wee therefore choose to begin with, because it is the foundation of the succeeding Controversies, and they stand or fall together with it: For the clearer decision, and Resolution whereof, wee must crave leave to premise some few Considerations.

First, That under the Law, there was a difference of *Places*, in regard of *Holinesse*, one more holy than another: as

1. The whole land of *Canaan* was called the *Holy land*, Zach. 2. 12. and was accounted more holy than other Lands were, as being the promised Land, the inheritance of Gods peculiar holy people, a Type of the Church on earth, and of

1. Difference of places under the Law.

1. The land of *Canaan.*

170 the Kingdom of heaven. And thereupon, the Saints of God did deſire to be buried there; *Jacob Gen.* 47. 29. *Joſeph Gen.* 50 25.

2. The Citie of *Ieruſalem.*

2. The Citie *Jeruſalem* was alſo called *the holy Citie*, Math. 4. 5. and 27. 53. becauſe God had choſen that place, above all others to dwell in, and to put his name there. [*At Salem is his Tabernacle, and his dwelling in Sion*, Pſal. 76. 2.]

3. The Temple in 3. degrees.

3. The *Temple* was yet more holy than the Citie, in any other parts thereof; becauſe that was, as it were, the Palace of the great King; and therefore called the *holy Temple*, Pſal. 5. 8. and often elſe-where, as the very Throne of his *Holineſſe*. And this *Temple* had its degrees of *Holineſſe*, according to the parts thereof.

1. The Court-yard.

1. The *Court-yard* (ſo called) the place where the people aſſembled. *Luc.* 1. 10. So holy a place, that our Saviour would not ſuffer any to carry a veſſell through it, *Mar.* 11. 16.

2. The Holy place.

2. The *Holy place*, ſo called, *Levit.* 6. 30. the place where the *Prieſts* officiated; ſo holy, that the people might not come into it: ſpoken of alſo, *Heb* 9 2.

3. The Holy of Holies.

3. The *Holy of Holies*, or the *moſt Holy place*, Heb. 9. 3. into which, none, but the *High-prieſt*, might goe, and that but once a yeare. Wee ſhut up this firſt Conſideration, with a double Obſervation: Firſt, that one Reaſon of the *Holineſſe*, aſcribed to theſe places, common to them all, was, their Typicall uſe, to ſignifie ſomething in the Goſpell; And as they did more neerely, and, as I may ſo ſay, more lively Typifie *Chriſt*, ſo the difference and degree of *Holineſſe* did ariſe; as the *Temple* was more *Holy*, becauſe it typified the body of *Chriſt*, in whom the Godhead dwelt bodily, *Col.* 2 9. as God did dwell Symbolically in the *Temple*: though other reaſons of their *holineſſe* are after rendred.

1

2

Secondly, we obſerve, that beſides theſe places, mentioned, wee read not of any ordinary, ſtanding place, that was called *holy*, in the old, or new *Teſtament*; For the *Synagogues*, which were ancient, and appointed for reading the Law, &c. are never (that I remember) called *holy*. And now wee proceed to another conſideration, to bee premiſed.

2. Holineſſe is two-fold.

Secondly, *holineſſe* (with reference to the creature) is diſtinguiſhed

stinguished into two sorts: *Inherent*, and *Relative*.

1. *Inherent holinesse*, is that, which is infused into the creature, by the *holy spirit* of God. And of this kinde of *holinesse*, none but rationall creatures, Angels, and Men, are capable. No other thing, Time, Place, can be said to be *inherently holy*. 1. Inherent.

2. *Relative holinesse*, then, is that alone whereof we now speak, with respect to something, without them, which doth denominate them *holy*. And it may be thus described, [*An holy thing, or place, is that, which being consecrated to God, is, by him, thence-forward, owned, as his peculiar.*] Thus wee shall heare the adverse party describe it hereafter; [*Relative holinesse, is nothing else, but a state of relation of peculiarity to God. &c.*] From which description of *holinesse*, in things or Places, flow, as proper Effects, or naturall Consequences, these particulars. 1. The unlawfulnesse of alienating them by Men, or imploying them, to other uses than *sacred*. 2. The power or virtue, of sanctifying the services of those that use them, making them more effectuall and acceptable; 3. Some perpetuall positive respect or Reverence, in the use of them, and such like. These all (if I mistake them not) are affirmed by some or other of the adverse part, in this present Controversie, as shall in due time be manifested. And there are but two things, as I suppose, that are made the grounds of this *Relative holinesse*, applyable unto Places, in the esteeme of one or other side, *viz.* The *holy God*, and the *holy things of God*, meeting in those Places. 2. Relative, which is, 1. Described. 2. Distinguished with respect.

1. The *holy God:* in relation unto whom, Places are called *holy* in a double respect. 1. His Presence. 2. His Precept or Command. 1. To God himselfe, and that

First his Presence there exhibited; which presence of God, is also distinguished, according to the manner of the exhibition; It is either *sensible, symbolicall*, or *spirituall*. 1. His presence, which is,

1. *Sensible and visible*, when God did please to manifest himselfe to be present, to the very eyes of men, by some shew of glory. And this was extraordinary, as in the *Bush* to *Mose*, Exod. 3. 5. The place where thou standest, is *holy ground*; 1. Sensible.

And such was that to *Joshuah*, Cap. 5. 15. And in this respect, the Mount, where our Saviour was transfigured, is called the *holy Mount*, 2 Pet. 1. 18.

2. Symbolical. 2. *Symbolicall*, or Ordinary, as in the *Temple*, upon the Ark, where God was constantly Resident, by a *Symbolicall presence*; The difference of this *holinesse*, from this different presence, was but this, That the *extraordinary or sensible presence* made the places *holy* onely for the present Time of apparition; the *ordinary or Symbolicall presence* made the place perpetually *holy*, during the good pleasure of God there to dwell.

3. Spirituall. 3. *Spirituall and invisible presence* is that which God especially affords unto his owne servants, and hath particularly promised to them, in the use of his holy Ordinances; [*Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them*, Math. 18. 20.] That is, when Gods people meet together in any place, hee is *spiritually* present with them; not with respect to the Place, but to the Persons. And therefore note, that he doth not say, I am in the midst of that Place, as in the Temple of old, but in the midst of Them: present in the Place, for *their* sakes, not present with Them, for the Places sake: For had they met in another place, his presence had attended them there, as well as here, where now they are assembled. Now this *spirituall presence of God* (we say) makes no place properly *holy*; because then, God being present *spiritually*, with all his Saints, when, and whersoever assembled, it would follow, that any Place, House, Chamber, Closet, Field, &c. should become *holy*; which, no man, I think, will affirme.

2. The Precept or Institution of God. 2. The Precept, or Institution of God, is another ground of *Relative holinesse*, in places: I meane, his *Sanctification*, or Consecration of them to holy uses; As the Tabernacle, and Temple, were made *holy places* of old; so powerfully sanctified by God, that they were made parts of his worship, effectuall meanes of grace, bringing acceptation of the persons, and services there performed; *holy*, not only during the time of the publick service, but also, at all other times, in so much, that

that it was utterly unlawfull, to change them, for other Places, or to imploy them to any other uses than sacred, without his expresse leave.

2. *Places*, are said to be *holy*, with respect to Holy things; as the Holy duties & exercises of Religion there performed, or Holy persons there assembled: And thus men use to speak that deale in this Controversie; saying, [*That places dedicated and set apart by the Church, for Gods worship, are holy, in relation to the duties there performed.*] But, by their leave, this, of all the rest, is a most improper *holinesse*; and places in this respect are very improperly called *holy*: For if *holy duties* (or persons) make any place *holy*, then every Place may be made and accounted *holy*, where holy persons meet, to performance of holy Duties. The *Apostles* and *Disciples* met together in private Houses, and by the River side, *Act.* 16. to Preach, Pray, celebrate the Sacrament: Here were holy Persons, and holy Duties, yet no man will say, as I suppose, those places were *holy*, in their use much lesse, after the use, when the duties ceased, and the persons were departed. In this sense, every private House, where Prayer is made, and the Word read, were as *holy* as the *Church*; which, how it will please some men, I doe not well conceive, but leave them to consider, and proceed to another consideration. 2. Holy things of God.

Thirdly then, It is a point of prerogative, belonging unto God alone, to Sanctifie any thing, to make it properly *holy*, that is, so to sanctifie, that the Thing is made a part of his Worship, an effectuall meanes of Grace, giving acceptation to the Worship, and to the worshippers; and so, that it is unlawfull to alienate it for another Thing, or to imploy it to any other use, than Sacred. This is generally granted, by all Orthodox Divines, and therefore I forbeare the further confirmation of it, unlesse it be required. 3. God onely can make Holy.

Fourthly, Whereas we often heare now adayes, that men doe *Consecrate*, or *Sanctifie* Things or Places; it must be understood, if not superstitiously, of an improper kind of *holines*, consisting onely in a Seperation of them from Secular Imployments, for order, decencie, & convenience; with a great 4. How men are said to sanctifie.

deale

deale of difference from the *Consecration* of God; in these and such particulars.

1. *Places* (to instance still in them) *Consecrated by Gods Institution* are thereby made parts or proper Meanes of worship, as the Temple of old was; but Places, Consecrated by Men, are onely circumstances of Worship for order, &c.

2. *Places Consecrated by God* sanctified both the *Worship*, and the Worshippers; as the *Altar* is said to sanctifie the *Gift*, and the Temple the Gold, *Matth.* 23. 18 19. But in Places sanctified by men; they say, the duties sanctifie the Places, if at all they be sanctified.

3. *Places Consecrated by God* were principall, the duties lesse principall, the Worship being appointed for the Places. But in those Consecrated by Men, the Duties are principall, the Places lesse principall, being appointed for the Duties sake. For example, The *Temple*, and *Altar*, being Types of *Christ*, were made more regardfull, than the very services presented in, or by them; to signifie that *Christ* is more worth, than our *Prayers* presented by him; and the Excellencie of them, flowes more from his Mediation, than the nature of them, in themselves, though commanded by God; and so Hee and his Types were indeed the Principall. But in the *Synagogues*, (and our *Churches*) the *Duties* were the principall, and indeed, all in all, the *Places* little or nothing.

4. *Places, sanctified by God*, were properly *holy*, with respect to the Institution; But Places *Sanctified* or *Consecrated* by Men, are improperly *holy*, onely with respect to the *holy duties* for which they are seperated and set apart.

5. *Places sanctified by God*, were *holy*, even *extra usum publicum*; they might not be imployed to any Uses, but sacred. But Places Consecrated by Men, if *holy* at all, are *holy* onely in the *Publike* use, with respect to the people of God, there, and then Assembled, and the *holy Exercises* there performed: As shall more fully appeare hereafter.

These things being thus premised for Explication, we now come to the Confirmation of the Negative, *That there is no more Holinesse in Churches, than in other Places, nor more Holinesse*

lineſſe in one place, or part of the Church, than in another; which thus we endevour to make good.

First, If all difference of *Places* be taken away in the time of the *Goſpell*, then all *Places* are equally *holy*, no one Place being *holyer* than another: and conſequently, the Church is not more *holy* than other places, nor one part of it more *holy* than another. But the difference of Places is taken away in the time of the *Goſpell*. *Ergo*. The *ſequell* is undeniable, the *aſſumption* we ſhall confirme, by this which followes. *Reaſon.* 1.

1. If the totall Reaſon of the difference of Places, in regard of *holineſſe*, be taken away, then the difference of Places is wholly taken away. This *ſequell* is alſo evidently ſtrong. But the totall Reaſon of the difference of Places is wholly taken away. This is proved by the particulars: The totall Reaſon of difference, or ſetled *holineſſe* of Places under the Law, was, 1. The *Symbolicall* preſence of God. 2. The Typicall uſe thereof. 3 The Command of God: But theſe are all ceaſed; For neither is there now any Symbolicall preſence of God, in any place exhibited; nor is there any Typicall uſe of Places, ſince *Chriſt* is now come, who was Typified by them, nor laſtly, is there extant, in the *new Teſtament*, any command of God, to make ſuch difference of Places: but rather the contrary, as ſhall appeare.

2. By the *Scriptures*, which ſeeme directly to lay all *places* levell, in regard of *holineſſe*, Joh. 4. 21. [*Jeſus ſaid unto her, Woman, beleeve me, the houre commeth, when you ſhall neither in this Mountaine, nor in Jernſalem, worſhip the Father.*] The meaning whereof is given to be this, That it ſhould be indifferent to worſhip God in any *place*, without reſpect of *holineſſe*, Efficacie, Acceptation, &c. And ſo the *Apoſtle*, 1 Tim. 2. 8. *I will that men pray everie where*, ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, in every place; without any ſcruple of difference, in regard of *holineſſe*, *Efficacie*, &c. If any man ſhall ſay (as ſome doe) that God heard the Prayers of his people in any place, under the Law, and they might pray in any place, and be heard. I anſwer. They might ſo pray, and be heard; but not ſo well: their Prayers were more effectuall in the Temple, than in

other places, because more holy, &c. But now that difference is taken away: As if the *Apostle* had said, There was a time when Prayer was more effectuall, and better accepted, in one place than another; but now men may pray in every place, with like successe, if they lift up pure hands, &c.

3. The *assumption* is also confirmed by the Testimonie of the adverse party, who expressly say, [*The differences of places, is not more taken away now, under the Gospel, than of times.*] That is, the differences of *times* and *places* are equally taken away, in the time of the *Gospell*. But of this more anone.

Reason 2. *Secondly*, thus wee reason, If things of Gods owne *Consecration*, or made *holy* by his Institution, be not now more *holy* than other things, nay, be not *holy* at all, after their use; then no *thing* or *place* of mans *Consecration* (as it is called) is more *holy* than another, after the use, what ever it be, in the use. But some things made *holy* by Gods *Institution*, are not holy at all, after their use; *ergo*. The *sequell* is strong, *à majore ad minus*: If Gods *Consecration* doe not make them *holy*, after their use, mens cannot. The *assumption* is manifest; The water in *Baptisme*, the bread and wine *consecrated* for the Lords Supper, even by divine Institution, and so more holy in the use, than others of the same kinde; yet after the Sacraments ended, are no more *holy*, but returne to be common as they were; in the judgement of all *Orthodox Divines*, and the practise of our *Church*: Therefore no *place*, and particularly, not the *Church*, seperated by Men, to holy uses, is *holy* after the publick use; what ever it be, in the use, with respect to the *holy duties*. Of which againe ere long.

Reason 3. *Thirdly*, If any place, (for example the *Church*) be more *holy* than another, even in the publick use, it would add vertue, and efficacie, and acceptation, to the worship there performed. But no place now adds vertue &c. to the worship: *ergo*. The sequell is evident, from the places Consecrated by God. The *Temple*, and *Altar*, did add Vertue, Efficacie, &c. to the Worship, there, and thereupon performed. The *Altar* sanctified the *Gift*, &c. The *assumption* is also manifest, because no *Consecration* of Men, can give efficacie to the Worship,

ſhip, but onely *the inſtituted of God.* In the old Law, not only the publick Worſhip, but alſo the private, was better, and more effectuall, &c. not onely *in*, but done *towards* the *Temple*, than in any other *place:* But to think, that any Worſhip, eſpecially private, performed *in*, or *towards* our *Churches*, is better accepted, &c. is a groſſe Superſtitious Popiſh conceit: For this is the Reſolution of *Gerſon*, and divers others of that Schoole, [*The Church or Conſecrated Place, is, by reaſon of its venerable condition, a Place provoking to Repentance:*] And thence he inferres many concluſions; [*Firſt, that ordinarily it is a work more holy in it ſelfe, more pleaſing to God, more profitable to us, to Pray in Conſecrated places, than elſe-where, &c.*] Which, what is it elſe, but to equall the *Tradition of Men*, with the *Inſtitutions of God?* And yet ſome of our owne have approved this Concluſion of his, and made uſe of it, to other ends, and by approving it have made it their owne: Let them conſider how they will avoid the juſt Cenſure of being *Superſtitious*. But we may, perhaps, call him to a particular account hereof, in another place. *De viia Cler.* *G. Iuonſ. 7. queſt. of Sab. p 277.*

Fourthly, If any *Church*, or any place or part of the *Church*, as *Chancell*, or *Table*, &c. be more holy, than another, then it muſt be made *holy*, by ſome, or more of theſe Meanes. 1 By *God*. 2. By *Men*. 3. By the *holy ſervices*, or duties done there, or thereupon. 4. By the particular *benefits*, obtained by Chriſtians, in thoſe places. Theſe are the only wayes, as I ſuppoſe, that can be pretended, for the *holineſſe* of thoſe *places:* But no *place* is now made *holy*, by any of theſe Meanes, as ſhall appeare in the particulars. *Reaſon.* 4.

1. For firſt; No *place* is now made holy, or more holy, by God himſelfe, for then, either by his Inſtitution, or by his ſpeciall Preſence there, more than in other places: But, neither of theſe wayes hath God made any *place* more *holy* than another. 1. Not by any Word of Inſtitution; for in all the *New Teſtament*, God hath not himſelfe, or by any Command, *ſanctified* any one *place*, more than another, or if hee have, let us ſee the Patent. 2. Nor by his ſpeciall preſence *there*, more than in other *places*; for then either by his *ſenſible*, or *Symbolicall*

licall Preſence, or by his *ſpirituall* preſence; But firſt, the *ſenſible* and *Symbolicall* preſence is altogether ceaſed; And ſecondly, the *ſpirituall* Preſence of God doth not make any *place holy*, as we proved above, or one Place more Holy than another; therefore, on Gods part, nothing can be pleaded to make *a place holy*. Yet this is the Reſolution of ſome who derive *holines* upon *Churches*, from the Preſence of God there; Thus one ſpeaks. [*The preeminence we give (to the Church or Table) is onely relative, in relation to the Preſence of God, in Places Conſecrate. And though the whole ſtructure be Gods houſe, and ſo hee more preſent there, than in other Places; yet his Preſence there hath degrees.*] Now, though we may grant, that God is Spiritually Preſent in the *Church*, during the Aſſembly there, by his ſpeciall aſſiſtance, and bleſſing, according to his promiſe: yet wee denie, that God is more Preſent in one *place* of the *Church*, than another, during the aſſembly, or in the *Church*, or any part therof, whē there is no aſſembly there.

Profanomaſt.

1. Not more in one *place* of the *Church*, than another, during the aſſembly: we have the promiſe of *Chriſt*, that *when*, or *where*, two or three are gathered together in his Name, he will be in the midſt of them, that is, equally Preſent, with all his people, *there* and *then* aſſembled. And no doubt, he is as (ſpiritually) *preſent* at the *Font*, whē Baptiſme is adminiſtred, at the *Pulpit*, when the Word is preached, as at the *Table*, whē the Lords Supper is Celebrated: So that, if this ſpeciall Preſence make a Place more *holy*, thē thoſe places take their turns, one now, then another *more holy*, which is abſurd, to ſay.

2. Not in the Church, more than in other places, when there is no aſſembly there; which we thus declare. 1. Wee have no word for it, no ſuch promiſe, and for men to tye, or affix God to a place, is high preſumption, and ſuperſtition. 2. We have no reaſon for it; For as for Chriſts bodily preſence, it is confined to the heavens, by the Scripture. As for his Godhead, it is incomprehenſible, and cannot be affixed to a place, without his owne good pleaſure, as of old. Laſtly, as for his ſpirituall preſence, it doth not make any place holy, in the uſe, much leſſe after the uſe is over. 3. Wee have, we think,

think, word and reaſon againſt it: For Chriſt having promiſed to be preſent, ſpiritually, onely with his Saints aſſembled, it is too much boldneſſe for men to tye him to a reſidence there, when and where there is no Aſſembly. From all which we conclude, Churches are not made holy by God.

2. Nor yet by men: For men cannot ſanctifie, or make holy one place (ſuppoſe the Church) or any part of the Church (ſuppoſe the Table) to make it properly holy, or more holy than another. For firſt, they that conſecrate a Church, &c. conſecrate all places and parts alike, therefore, either they are all equally holy, or all equally common, and not holy. 2. Many Tables are brought new into the Church, and never conſecrated at all, therfore wanting humane Conſecration they are not holy at al, or not ſo holy as other parts, which are conſecrated. 3. It belongs to God alone, as was confeſſed above, to ſanctifie a thing properly, as to be a part and meanes of worſhip, to add holineſſe, efficacie, acceptation, to the worſhip, &c. Laſtly, it is confeſſed, that all the Holineſſe that men can put upon a place, is only relative, with reſpect to the holy Services, for which they are conſecrated, or ſet apart: And therefore, the Holineſſe proceeds (if any there be in the places) rather from the holy Services, than from humane conſecration, which come next to be conſidered.

But firſt we will conſider, what holineſſe ſome are pleaſed to aſcribe to the Churches conſecration, and how much preſence of God they imagine to be in the places conſecrated. Thus one delivers it. [*The truth is, that peculiar bleſſing, which God once beſtowed upon the Temple, and thereby differenced it from others, is enlarged to all places: and any place, may, by the Church, be dedicated and ſet apart for Gods worſhip; and being ſo dedicated and ſet apart, it inherits that Holineſſe which was once peculiar unto the Temple, in relation to the duties there performed to God, who in regard of the abundance of grace, vouchſafed now in the time of the Goſpell, may be ſaid, to be more preſent in ſuch places, than heretofore, in thoſe of his owne aſſigning.*] How confident ſoever this man is, to affirme this as a truth, yet wee doubt not to affirme it to be erroneous, more wayes than

C. Dowe Diſc. of Sab. p. 38.

than one: which this wee manifeſt.

1. It is an untruth to ſay, That any place dedicated and ſet apart by the Church, for Gods worſh p, inherits that Holineſſe which was once peculiar to the Temple. For, 1. The Temple was Holy, by more rights than one, by divine inſtitution, by Symbolicall preſence, by typicall uſe; and ſo was a part and meanes of worſhip, made the Services effectuall, acceptable, might not be imployed to any other uſes than ſacred; which, if any man ſhall affirme of our Churches, I ſhall more admire his confidence, than his judgement. 2. The Synagogues (the patternes of our Churches) were ſet apart by the Jewiſh Church, to the morall worſhip of God; yet hee were very bold, that ſhould affirme, that they were as holy as the Temple. And thirdly, In his own confeſſion, they are holy, onely with relation to the duties there performed to God: But the Temple was holy, without relation to the duties there performed; and the place ſanctified the duties, not the duties the places: therefore the difference is palpable and apparent.

2. It is alſo an untruth, and an erroneous aſſertion, to ſay, That in regard of the abundance of grace, now vouchſafed, God may be ſaid, to be more preſent in our Churches, than heretofore in thoſe places of his owne aſſigning. For, 1. That the power of diſpenſing grace, is in the Churches Conſecration, is manifeſtly falſe; as if it were in their power, to conſecrate Places to be effectuall meanes of grace to them that uſe them. 2. To give the preheminence to places of mens conſecration, that God muſt be more preſent there, than in places of his owne aſſigning, is moſt high preſumption; to make God wait upon the Traditions of men, who doth not tye himſelfe, no not to his owne inſtitutions, to diſpence grace alwayes, much leſſe, to mens. 3. The abundance of grace now vouchſafed, is not with reſpect to any place whatſoever, but with relation to his owne ordinances, then, or there performed, to his owne people there aſſembled, and indeed principally, to hi owne promiſe made unto them both: So that for all this, it doth not appeare, that there is any vertue in the

the conſecration of men, to put any relative holineſſe, properly ſo called, upon the Church, but it is done, if it be done, by relation to the holy Services; which now comes next to be conſidered.

3. Neither doe the particular Services, done, in, at, or upon the parts or places ſpecified, make them more holy than other parts or places. Yet ſome there are that ſo imagine; who ſay, [*In what place we have the moſt lively demonſtration of Gods preſence, by ſome thing either done, or ſaid there, as in a place, and at an inſtrument, appropriated to that Service, there is the higheſt Court, of, or for his Holineſſe, called the place of Majeſtie, &c.*] But that this is moſt abſurd, ſhall thus appeare. For, Profanomaſt.

1. If the particular Services done at or upon any place doe make it more holy, and God more preſent; then, any place where thoſe Services are done, (and they may be done in any place) ſhould be more holy, which is abſurd. Yea, the Font, the Reading Pew, the Pulpit, were more holy than the Table, when there is no Sacrament there adminiſtred.

2. This is contrary to the old rule, The Altar ſanctified the gift, and not the gift the Altar: But here the Service is made to ſanctifie the place, and not the place the ſervice.

3. If the Place or Part be Sanctified by the particular Service, then, the Chalice, and Pattine (as ſome call it) containing the bread and wine conſecrated, were more holy than the Table, by vertue of a more immediate touch of holy things: Yea, the hands of the Miniſter (or Clerk) carrying the conſecrated elements, the hands and mouthes of every Receiver, were all made holy, by touching of holy things, and might not be uſed to common uſes: and ſo no end of ſuperſtition.

4. Certainly the bread and wine, in the Lords Supper, (and ſo the water uſed in Baptiſme) were in all reaſon to be accounted more holy, even after the uſe, than the Table: The reaſon is, *Quod efficit tale, eſt magis tale*; Which the practiſe of all times, accounting and uſing them as common, after the

14

the Sacred uſe, doth clearely contradict. If therefore the conſecrated Elements loſe their Holineſſe, and returne to their common nature, and uſe, much more doth the Table loſe its Holineſſe, if it had any, after the uſe is over. And againe; if God be not preſent with the Elements, after their uſe, more than with other things, much leſſe is he preſent at the Table, or in the Church, when the publick uſe is ceaſed.

5. Laſtly, if the conſecration of the Elements on the Table, doe make it holy, even when there is no Sacrament, as theſe men ſay, then, when the Miniſter viſits the ſick, and conſecrates the Sacrament, upon a common Table, or a Cheſt, when there is no Table, That Table or Cheſt is alſo made holy, and may no more be imployed to any common uſe: or elſe ſome other way muſt be deviſed, to prevent this inconvenience, which yet I doe not name.

4. If none of thoſe wayes make the Church or Table holy, there remaines but only one way more to be imagined, and that is, The particular benefits, obtained by Chriſtians, in or at thoſe parts and places. And thus likewiſe ſome derive an Holines, upon ſome places. [*At the Font (ſayes one) children obtaine remiſſion of their ſins, are made the children of God &c. ample priviledges, and ſuch as doe procure honour and Holineſſe to the ſacred Font, from whence they flow.*] Not to take all exceptions that offer themſelves in this Aſſertion, this I onely ſay; That by this way, the river Jordan, wherein *John* baptized, and the Baſon uſed in baptiſme, in a private houſe, and the ſick mans Table, we ſpake of before, ſhould all be made holy, and never more to be uſed in common affaires. Such, and many more, are the abſurdities, which they muſt needs runne into, who once forſake the truth.

D.D. Determ.

To draw to an end of this argument. If any man ſhall ſay (as ſome doe) that, [*Though the particular ſervices be not alwayes in act, yet the Demonſtration ceaſeth not, becauſe the ſame place, and things are reſerved ſtill, for the ſame purpoſe, and Gods relative propriety not aboliſhed, the great ſigne of his preſence ſtill abiding.*] To this we ſay; That hee beggs the queſtion more than once: As 1. when he ſaith, The Demonſtration

Profanomaſt.

of

of Gods preſence ceaſeth not, though the Services be not alwayes in act: and then againe, in ſaying, that the great ſigne of his preſence ſtill abideth. For I demand, what is it, that demonſtrates, or ſignifies Gods preſence? Is it not the Sacrament, upon the Table? But doth that alwayes remaine, when there is no Sacrament? It doth indeed, with Papiſts, who have the Hoſt (as they call it) alwayes reſident upon their Altar, but not yet with us, who make no reſervation of the conſecrated Elements, but command them to be preſently ſpent: And if he meane, that the Table is the Demonſtration and ſigne of Gods preſence, he may ſay the ſame, & as much of the Font, or Pulpit. 2. He beggs againe, ſuppoſing that the preſence of God, once exhibited in a place, makes it perpetually holy; for if ſo, then the Buſh wherein God appeared to *Moſes*, and other places, where God manifeſted himſelfe to men, ſhould have beene perpetually holy, in as much, as the ſigne of that preſence did afterwards remaine. 3. Hee ſuppoſes alſo, that the ſpirituall preſence of God doth make a place properly, and perpetually holy, which is untrue. 4. He takes for granted, which is denied, that humane conſecration, doth not onely give to God a propriety in the places, but alſo puts holineſſe upon them, even *extra uſum publicum*, ſo farre, that they may not be otherwiſe imployed; which is contrary to experience, and the common practiſe of the Church, or State, wherein Churches themſelves have beene made common ground, turned into Gardens or Paſtures.

And now we proceed to another argument. To bring in Superſtition into the Church is utterly unlawfull; But to make one place or part of the Church more holy than another, is to bring in Superſtition: *ergo*. The *minor*, which onely needs confirmation, is thus made good. 1. To make any thing a part, or *medium* of worſhip, which God hath not made ſo, is to bring in Superſtition: But to make one place, or part of the Church more holy than another, God not having made it ſo, is to make it a part or *medium* of worſhip, *ergo*. 2. To make any place or part ſo holy, that it may not be alienated, or imployed to any common uſe, is to bring in Superſtition: *Reaſon* 5.

ſtition: but to make one place or part of the Church properly holy, is to make it ſo holy that it may not be alienated, or imployed to any common uſe: *ergo.* The *major* is proved by this, that it belongs onely to God to make any thing ſo, and in the manner aforeſaid, holy: Therefore for men to doe it, is to bring in Superſtition, againſt the ſecond commandement.

Reaſon 6. Further thus we argue. That opinion, which is the proper and direct ground of many more Superſtitions, is falſe and erroneous. But this opinion, That one place is holyer than another, hath beene, and is the proper and direct ground of many Superſtitions, *ergo.* The *minor* is proved by many inſtances, amongſt the Papiſts; who build many Superſtitious practices upon this opinion. As 1. Their Pilgrimages to the Holy Land, (as they will ſtill call it) to *Loretto*, and other places, eſteemed of greater holineſſe. 2. Buriall in Conſecrated ground, as better, and more profitable to the dead. 3. Private prayer in publick places, which they hold to be more effectuall, becauſe the place is conceived to be more holy: and divers other ſuch like; whereof more hereafter.

Wee add another argument, *ad hominem*: If all Dayes or Times be equall, in regard of Holineſſe, under the Goſpell, then all places are alſo equall in regard of Holineſſe. The reaſon of the ſequell is, becauſe (as they ſay) Time and Place are equall circumſtances of worſhip. But all dayes and times (ſay they alſo) are equall in regard of Holineſſe, in themſelves conſidered, for they are holy (ſay they) and ſo called, onely with reſpect to the Holy duties done on ſuch a day: But Holy duties doe very improperly denominate a Day to be Holy: Therefore, if places be equall with Times, and holy onely with reſpect to the holy duties, they are alſo very improperly called holy. And I cannot but wonder, that they that diſpute againſt all Holineſſe in Dayes, ſhould yet put Holineſſe in places, making one more holy than another.

If it be ſaid by them, That they as well wonder at us, who taking

taking away all Holineſſe from Places, are yet ſo rigorous for holineſſe in ſome Dayes, making one more holy than another, to wit, the Lords Day, which wee call, and keep holy, as our Sabbath.

To this I anſwer. That the advantage is on our ſide: For there is more reaſon for diſtinction of Dayes, in regard of Holineſſe, than for places. As 1. Becauſe it is granted by themſelves, that, to have ſome ſet, ſufficient Time, to be dedicated to God, is morall naturall, but not ſo, to have any ſet place. 2. Wee have the fourth Commandement expreſly for one Day in 7 to be kept holy, or (as themſelves ſpeak) ſome ſufficient Time, not leſſe than one Day in ſeaven. But wee have no commandement to make any diſtinction of places, But rather a liberty to hold all indifferent, *Joh.* 4. 1 *Tim.* 2. 8. And 3. We have the Apoſtolicall practice, for obſervation of the Lords day, which, conſidering the two former reaſons, amounts to a Divine inſtitution. But there is no Apoſtolicall practice, making difference of places, but rather a contrary command, *ergo.*

And now, I might fetch my laſt argument from Authorities of all, or moſt Orthodox Divines, who herein concurre with one conſent, That there is now no Holineſſe in any place, but with reſpect to the holy Aſſemblies, and holy duties there exerciſed, and in Act. I ſhall name but one for all; Our Church in her Homilies, approved, as part at leaſt, of her Doctrine, thus expreſſes it. [*The Church or Temple is called Holy, and ſo accounted, yet not in it ſelfe, but becauſe Gods people reſorting thereunto, are Holy, and exerciſe themſelves in holy, and heavenly things.*] And with this I end. *Reaſon* 8. Hom. of repairing Churches, *p.* 79.

CHAP. II.
Concerning reverence in the Church.

WEe have beene ſomewhat larger in the former Diſcourſe, concerning the *Holineſſe* of *Churches*, or *Places*, becauſe indeed as wee have ſaid, that is the

foundation of many other ſuperſtitious ſuperſtructions. Beſides others, there are three eſpecially to be conſidered, which flowe by way of naturall conſequence, at leaſt, in ſome mens practiſe, from the former ground. For, this being granted, or ſuppoſed, that ſome *places* are more *holy* than others, for inſtance, the *Church*, more than the *Churchyard*, and in the Church, the *Table*, more than other parts thereof, they have rationally, as they think, inferred, 1. That greater *reverence* is due, in the *Church*, at entrance thereinto, than in other places. 2. *Bowing*, or *adoration* to, or towards the *Altar*, (ſo they now call the Table) as the moſt *holy place*. 3. *Private prayer* in a *Church* as being (by vertue of more *holineſſe* there, and more ſpeciall *Divine preſence*) made more *effectuall*, more *acceptable*, than if it was made in another place. As on the contrary, If there be no more *Holineſſe* in the *Church*, no more *ſpeciall preſence of God* there, (ſecluding the aſſemblies) than in other places, thoſe three before mentioned (and many more perhaps) done in or at thoſe places, with thoſe relations and reſpects, of more *Holineſſe*, and more *ſpeciall preſence*, are eaſily concluded ſuperſtitious. Thus much only in the generall, wee come to conſider them aſunder, and in order, beginning firſt, with that Reverence pleaded for in the Church.

Profanomaſt. There are two things inſiſted on, by ſome of late in this behalfe. Firſt, that the *Church* be not perverted to *ſecular imployments*, but reſerved onely for ſacred uſes. 2. That more Reverence is due, there, at all times, than in other places. And both theſe are inferred from the former premiſes of more *Holineſſe*, and *divine preſence there*, than in other places, we ſhall ſay ſomething briefly to both.

1. The firſt is, That the *Church* ought not to be perverted to any *ſecular imployments*, &c. Concerning which aſſertion, wee have three things to ſay, Firſt, that this will not bee yeelded by ſome, and not without appearance of reaſon: For they ſuppoſe, that the *Synagogues of the Jewes* were every whit as *holy* as our *Churches*; being builded, ſeperated, dedicated, for the publick *worſhip of God*, the aſſembling of the people

people, to divine Services, praying, reading, expounding, and hearing of the word: And yet it ſeemes that there was no ſuch reſpect or *reverence* given to them, but that they were ſometimes imployed to *ſecular uſes*. For the manifeſtation whereof, they may bee pleaſed to remember and conſider, what is the ſenſe and meaning of that text, *Math.* 23. 34. [*And ſome of them you ſhall ſcourge in your Synagogues.*] For the interpretation whereof, by *Synagogues*, in Scripture, is never meant any place of onely *ſecular meetings*, but of *ſacred aſſemblings*. And then, concerning the phraſe of *ſcourging* in the *Synagogues*, two things onely can be pretended, either firſt, that they did in their *Synagogues* inflict the puniſhment of *ſcourging*, or whipping upon the parties cenſured, which the letter ſeems to imp ort: or ſecondly, that they did there ſit in *judgement* upon delinquents, and cenſure them to be *ſcourged*, though the execution of it were done in ſome other places. If either of theſe were done there; then, behold, a place as *holy* as our *Churches* imployed to a *ſecular uſe*; and if ſo then, what hinders, but it might be ſo now? And indeed, what is that leſſe, which is now commonly done in ſome of our Churches, where there are *Conſiſtories* erected, and *Courts* kept, and that in the *holyeſt place* thereof, the *Chancell*, where cenſures are impoſed upon ſome d:linquents, unholy enough, for fornication, adultery, &c. If any ſay theſe are eccleſiaſticall caſes, ſubjected to the cenſures of the Church: I grant it of ſome, but not of all, as Wills, Tithes, Defamations, but yet they are not ſacred enough, ſome of them, for ſuch holy places, as thoſe are pretended to be.

Secondly, if this Author meane it abſolutely, that it is unlawfull to doe any ſecular thing in the Church, he muſt needs be ſuperſtitious, taking upon him, to put that *holineſſe* upon a *place*, which none but God can impoſe: *ſcil.* to make it ſo *holy*, that it may not be otherwiſe imployed.

Thirdly, ſuppoſe we grant him, that the *Church* ought not to be perverted to *ſecular uſes*, during the ſeperation of it, by the Church, to divine imployments. Yet this wee doe not yeeld upon his grounds, becauſe it is more holy, or God

more preſent there, at all times, than in other places, but becauſe of that order, and decencie, &c. which is required in the ſervice of God. For it is not convenient or decent, that the *Church* which is ſequeſtred to *holy uſes*, ſhould be imployed to any *ſeeular*, much leſſe to any *ſordide uſes*. And though wee doe deny any *poſitive reverence* to be due there, yet *negative reverence* we are ready to yeeld, that is, that the things, or places, ſeperated and ſubſervient to *Religious duties*, be not abuſed, or made deſpicable, by any *contemptuous uſage*. As, that the bread left after the Sacrament ſhould be caſt to dogges, or the wine ſpent to drunkenneſſe, the Table uſed to profane drinkings, the Church it ſelfe made a receptable for Hogges or Horſes, &c. This wee doe abhorre; but think it fit, that they be decently and cleanlily kept for the ſervice of God, to which they are devoted. But this indeed is no more than a *civill reverence*, due to any place of publick meeting, a Senate-houſe, or the like. And this we add, that if the Church, upon juſt reaſons, ſhall think it fit to ſubſtitute other *things*, or *places*, for *divine imployments*, then thoſe former *things*, or *places*, doe returne to their common nature, and uſe, which could not be done, in *things* or *places* ſanctified by God, without moſt hainous ſacriledge. For example: If the *Communion Table*, *Font*, or *Pulpit*, ſhall wax old, and unfit for the ſervice, the *Church* may, and muſt ſubſtitute others in their places, by the rule of order and decencie. But what ſhall be done with the old ones? Why, ſay ſome, they muſt be reſerved, and not imployed to any common uſe, that were to profane *holy things*. But is not this to runne into ſuperſtition, while they would avoid profaneneſſe? Is not this to equall the conſecration of men, with the Sanctification of God? And is not that opinion of *holineſſe*, in *things* or *places*, the ground of this, and more ſuperſtition? I my ſelfe once heard a learned Doctors diſcourſe, concerning an old *Surplice*. The queſtion was made, what ſhould be done with it, when it grew old and unfit for wearing any longer? Might not the Miniſter or Churchwardens take it home, & imploy it to ſome domeſtical uſes?

The

The learned *Rabbi* anſwered, no, by no meanes, it muſt not be ſo profaned. What then? It muſt (ſaid he) make *abſterſoria* Towells for the Miniſter to wipe his hands on, after he hee hath baptized a childe. And it was demanded further, what ſhould be done with thoſe Towells, when they were become raggs. His anſwer was, They muſt be burnt. Moſt rationally ſpoken, and *Durand* like: But if a man had asked him once more, what muſt be done with the aſhes, I doubt not, but he would have concluded, they muſt be buried under the Altar, or reſerved to make a lye to waſh the holy veſtments: There is no end of ſuperſtitious vanities, if once we part from the truth. That opinion of *holineſſe* in *things* or *places* is guilty of this and many more ſuperſtitions.

2. And that appeares by his ſecond concluſion, upon the ſame premiſe, and that is this, [*That more Reverence is due there (in the Church) at all times than elſe-where:*] That is, not onely in the time of publike ſervice, (which is granted) but alſo, when upon private occaſions men come into a Church. This concluſion is inferred upon the former premiſes, of more *holineſſe*, and more *ſpeciall preſence* of God there, at all times, than in other places; And by *reverence*, here, he meanes, not that *negative reverence* before ſpoken of, but ſome *poſitive reverence*, proſtrating or bowing of the body; for ſo he doth expreſſe himſelf. Now that no ſuch *poſitive reverence* is due to the *Church*, at ſuch a time, is thus concluded from our former grounds. If there be no more *holineſſe*, nor more *ſpeciall preſence* of God there, than in other places, (excepting the times of publick aſſemblies and ſervice) then no more *poſitive reverence* is due there, than in other places. But the Antecedent is abundantly confirmed above. *Ergo.* The ſequell is thus confirmed, Thoſe two things are pleaded as the ground of all this *reverence*; if therefore they be removed by force of reaſon, the ground failing, the ſuperſtructure muſt needs come downe. And thus much may be ſpoken in generall, wee come to particulars.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Concerning Bowing to, or towards the Altar.

I Propound this Queſtion, with a double expreſſion, of *Bowing* to, or towards the *Altar*; becauſe the practiſers and maintainers of it, do thus differently expreſſe it. Some there are, who ſay directly and *in terminis*, they doe, or may bow, not onely *towards*, but *to* the *Altar*: So the Author of a tract, called, *Sunday no Sabbath*, is bold to affirme. [*If wee doe not onely bend or bow our body* (to) *his* bleſſed board, *or holy* Altar, *but fall flat on our faces, ſo ſoone as ever wee approach in ſight thereof, &c. who would condemne us for it.*] Why, Sir, not onely many Proteſtants, but even Papiſts doe condemne you, if ſo you doe, for the greateſt Idolaters in the world, and worſe than Papiſts themſelves, who have their God alwayes in a Box upon the Table, leſt they ſhould worſhip a peece of wood. Others are yet more modeſt, and they call it, *Adoration towards*, or *before* the *Altar*, more nicely perhaps, than wiſely, upon their owne Principles. For, 1. Though they doe not bow *to* the *Altar*, as to the ultimate object of their Adoration: yet they doe bow to it, as to the next and moſt immediate object of it: which is ſtrongly proved from the former grounds, by themſelves laid, as the reaſons of this adoration towards the Altar, rather than any other place; which are more *holineſſe*, and more *ſpeciall preſence* of God there. This relation had to the *Altar* in their Adoration, cauſes the worſhip to be in part tendered to the Altar, as a *medium* of worſhip, which is ultimately terminated in God. Juſt as Papiſts adore and worſhip Images: For they doe not uſe the Image objectively, as terminating their worſhip ultimately therein; but ſay, they worſhip God, or Chriſt, *in, by, through, before*, or *towards* the Image; which is direct Idolatry. 2. In Scripture uſage, to bow, kneele, worſhip, before God, is all one, as to bow to, kneele to, and to worſhip God; as is evident in many places thereof. *Deut.* 26. 10.

Pſal.

Sunday no Sab. p. laſt.

Thus 'to worſhip the Table) is ſo palpable Idolatry, as cannot be incident to any Heathen. *G. Iroul. 7. queſt.* of *Sab. 6. p.* 279.

*Pſal.*22.27. & 72.9. & 86.9. & 95.6. and infinite more; So likewiſe, bowing, kneeling, worſhipping, and falling downe, *before* or *towards* Images or Altars, is the ſame with bowing, kneeling, &c. *to* Images or Altars, as theſe places manifeſt; 2 *Chron.*25.14. *Iſay* 44.15.17.19. *Dan.*3.3.5,6. So when St. *John* would worſhip the Angell, he ſayes, I fell downe *before* the feet of the Angell, *Rev.*19. 10. and 22.8. Yea, the Devill himſelfe, when he tempted our Saviour to worſhip himſelfe, He ſayes thus; If thou wilt fall downe, or worſhip *before me*, all thoſe ſhall bee thine, *Luk.*4.7. which *Math.*4.9. is thus expreſſed; If thou wilt fall downe and worſhip me. From whence it is apparant, that our *Altar-worſhippers*, who would acquit themſelves from Superſtition and Idolatry, by this diſtinction, of Bowing *before* and *towards* the *Altar*, and not *to* the *Altar*, cannot ſo evade, but that either they excuſe and free Papiſts, who ſay alſo, they bow not *to* the Image or Crucifix, but *before* it, or to Chriſt, *towards* it; or elſe they doe intangle themſelves ſo farre in Superſtition, that there is little or no difference betweene themſelves and Papiſts: For while they doe require, that the face be *towards* the *Altar*, and if the back were ſo, it were (as they ſay) with them, unreverence and prophanation, and withall, doe it with thoſe reſpects of more Holineſſe, and more ſpeciall preſence of Chriſt there; There, *towards*, and *before*, muſt needs be *to* the Altar, at leaſt in part, which is enough to ſtile them ſuperſtitious and idolatrous. But take them as they pleaſe: They bow, they ſay, not *to* the *Altar*, but to God, *towards* the *Altar*; Now we demaund a reaſon, why they bow *towards* the *Table*, rather than towards the Font or Pulpit, or any other place, or part of the Church: And they anſwer, They doe it, becauſe firſt, it is the moſt holy place, or part of the Church. 2. Becauſe it is the moſt preſentiall place: both which, if they bee denyed, and not proved, the bowing *towards* the *Table*, with thoſe reſpects, muſt needs bee ſuperſtitious, to ſay no more. And thus we reaſon againſt it from our former grounds. *Davenant determ.*

1. If there be no more *Holineſſe*, no more *ſpeciall preſence* of God there, than in other places; then, the bowing *towards* the *Table*, with thoſe reſpects, is Superſtitious. But the firſt is proved true above, *ergo*.

2. To make any thing *pars* or *medium cultus*, which God hath not made ſo, is ſuperſtitious, againſt the ſecond Commandement. But to bow *towards* the *Table* with opinion of more *Holineſſe*, and *more*

ſpeciall

1913
24

speciall presence of God there, is so to doe, as hath above beene proved. *Ergo.*

3. To bow *to*, or *towards* the Bread and Wine, after the Sacrament is ended, as more holy, or as the place of Christs more *speciall presence*, is superstitious: Therefore much more is it superstitious, to bow *to* or *towards* the *Table*, with the same opinion and respects. The consequence is evident, *à majore ad minus*; Those elements are farre more likely, to be more *holy*, and to be the place of more *speciall presence*, than the *Table*, because they were properly holy, in their use, by divine Institution; Therefore, if it be (as it is) superstitious to bow *to* or *towards* them, with those respects, much more to bow *towards* the *Table*, with the same respects. The Antecedent is the judgement of all orthodox Divines: and besides, it hath been proved by the practice of the Church, that there is no more *holinesse*, no more *speciall presence* of Christ in them, after the use, *ergo*, to bow *to* them, or *towards* them, with that opinion, is superstitious, and very neere if not altogether Idolatrous. And indeed, what hath bin the ground of Popish reservation of the Elements, and adoration of the Host, but this conceit, at least in part, That they are more holy, and Christ more specially (even corporally) present there than in other places: And here this opinion I feare will end, if it bee not timely stayed.

4. I adde yet a fourth reason, directed especially against those that say and teach that we may bow, not onely *towards*, but also *to* the *Table*; Thus I dispute against this opinion and practise. If it be not lawfull to adore, or bow *to* the *consecrated elements* during the time of the Sacrament, then much lesse *to* the *Table*, when there is no Sacrament: The sequell is strong, *à majore ad minus*: The Antecedent is thus confirmed; because all adoration of a creature, is Idolatry against the second Commandement; Thou shalt not bow down to it, nor worship it, *&c*, And therefore Papists themselves, to justifie their Adoration of the Host, as they call it, are forced to flye to their Transubstantiation, and imagine the bread to bee turned into their God; For they confesse, if it were not so, but remained still meere bread, they were most grosse Idolaters. Now we, for our parts doe confesse it to be bread still, and so a creature and not God; therefore we cannot without Idolatry terminate our Adoration upon it; The Adoration which is tendered in receiving of the Sacrament, is tendered onely unto God, in the use of his owne ordinance; For the clearer expression of this, what honour or reverence

is due to the Sacramentall elements, I shall make bold to transcribe and translate, what I find in two learned and judicious Divines, professors of Divinitie in severall Universities.

First, one thus declares himselfe. *Although divine honour is not to bee applyed unto Sacred things in their use; Nor those things to bee accounted for the next objects of that worship, by which the worship is tendered to God, nor lastly any worship of inferiour kind is to be bestowed upon them, all which are the errours of Papists, whilst first they worship the Host as God. 2. Images as the next, though not the ultimate objects of religious worship; And 3. holy vessels, with a certaine religious observance; Yet that honour which is due to God, cannot bee yeelded duly unto him, unlesse the instruments thereof be handled with singular reverence, because of that strict or neere connexion and relation, which is betweene the act, and instrument of that Act.* D. Ames. cas. conf. lib. 4. c. 3. sect. 2.

The other is more large and full in his expression. *This I say, there is no positive veneration of the Sacrament, (to bee indeed that which it is called) unlesse it be the Adoration of that thing whereof it is a Sacrament, in the use of the Sacrament. For there is one veneration of the Signes, which is Negative, if I may so say, by which wee take heed lest wee use them uncomely or prophanely; So wee doe reverence the temples dedicated to God, when we abstaine from violation or prophanation of them, and carry not our selves undecently in them. But of things that want sense, there can be no Positive veneration lawfully, which may carry the name of Adoration, unlesse it be the Adoration of God, in the use of the thing. As wee reverence the reading of the sacred Scripture, hearing it, with heads uncovered; that is honouring God, speaking to us, with an adoring gesture, Neither is that our veneration or adoration any wayes terminated in the words written or spoken. But that our adorative gesture is partly, thanks-giving, whereby we praise God for his revealed Mysteries, and gracious speaking to us, partly it is a kind of Prayer, that God would make our hearing saving to us: Otherwise, if we grant any religious adoration to a meere Creature, however wee cloake it with the name of Veneration, wee are not farre from Idolatry. So in receiving of the Eucharist, that positive veneration, or adoration, whereby wee reverently, and by an adoring way, receive the Symbols or Signes, reached to us, is the worship & adoration of God; For to use the divine Mysteries reverently, is to use them with the reverence of God. Neither ought the least adoring devotion of our mind tend, or be fastened any where, or upon any thing, but upon God and in God. Therefore to adore or venerate the mysticall Symbols, is* D. Forbes Professor. Aberdon. Irenic. p. 350.

to uſe them with adoration and veneration of God. Thus much I thought good to tranſcribe, that men may rightly underſtand how to direct their adoration in the uſe of holy things. If any man learned, deſire to ſee how he anſwers the ſpeech of *Theodoret*, *The myſticall Symbols are worſhipped*, hee may conſult the Authour in the place above mentioned, and receive (I thinke) full ſatisfaction.

μυστικὰ σύμβολα προσκυνεῖται.

bject. 1. But ſome objections may be made, the ſolution whereof will yet further cleare the point in hand; As firſt it may be ſaid; If it be lawfull to adore God, *towards*, or *before the ſacred Elements*, (not making them objects of our worſhip) why then may it not be alſo lawfull to adore or worſhip God, *towards* or *before* the *Table*, and not make it an object of our worſhip. To this I anſwer.

ol. The difference is much betweene the things propounded; For firſt, the *Elements* in their uſe are meanes of worſhip, and that by Gods appointment, ſo is not the *Table*, but a meere inſtrument of humane inſtitution. 2. Becauſe the Elements in their uſe are properly holy by divine ſanctification, and Chriſt there ſpiritually preſent; But neither of theſe (as we have proved) are applyable to the *Table*. 3. If any ſay, when we doe adore *before* the Elements, wee doe at the ſame time adore *before* the Table, and cannot chooſe but doe ſo; therefore if it be unlawfull to bow before the *Table*, it may alſo ſeeme unlawfull to bow before the *Elements*. To this I anſwer by diſtinction as afore; To bow before the *Table*, meerely as a place, inſtrument, or part of the Church, is not unlawfull: But if we ſhould bow *towards* or *before* it, with thoſe religious reſpects of more *holineſſe*, or more *ſpeciall preſence* of Chriſt in it, than in other places of the Church, we ſhould be ſuperſtitious, if not Idolatrous. Laſtly, We ſpeake of *bowing* before the *Table*, at other times, chiefly when there is no Sacrament; and therefore this objection doth not hurt our cauſe.

Yet ſome perhaps will be readie to lay hold upon our former grant, That it is lawfull to bow *before* the *Table*, conſidered meerely as a place or part of the Church, as well as it is lawfull to bow towards any other part of the Church; For our Poſture of Adoration *D.D.* muſt be directed ſome way, and no way is limited by God, Eaſt, Weſt, North or South, but all left indifferent; Whereupon they will inferre, that then, it being in it ſelfe indifferent and lawfull, the Church hath power to determine which way men ſhall direct their poſture of Adoration, and having determined, ſhee muſt bee obeyed. And this is as much as they deſire.

To

To this I anſwer; 1. We grant that it is as lawfull to bow or adore *before* the *Table*, as any other part or place of the Church, conſidering them meerely as parts or places without any religious reſpects: but then we ſay, it is as lawfull to direct our poſture any other way, or to any other part of the Church, ſo conſidered, as towards the Table; but this will little pleaſure them who plead for our adoration to bee directed this way, and towards this part, rather than any other, and give us religious reaſons for it; For if they left it ſtill indifferent, we ſhould not much contend. 2. If then they will relinquiſh that hold, I meane thoſe reaſons, as weake and erroneous, we ſhall follow them to the preſent ſcruple now objected; And this I ſay firſt; Our Church hath not determined yet, our poſture to be this way directed, but left it free for men to uſe, or not to uſe. But ſecondly, we crave leave to conſider whether the Church hath any ſuch power, I meane, whether ſhee may lawfully determine all men to direct their poſture *towards* the *Table*, rather than to any other part of the Church. And, with due reſpect unto our Mother, we may and doe ſuppoſe ſhe cannot: For though the Churches power extends to indifferent things, and them onely; yet the Church cannot command the uſe of every thing indifferent in the ſervice of God, but muſt have due reſpect to other rules as well as this, whereby ſhe muſt direct her determinations. And they are theſe; 1. Of *Order* and *decencie*. 2. All *appearance of evill* muſt be avoided, and things of *evill report*. 3. All *occaſions of ſuperſtition* are to be prevented as much as may be. Now if the Church ſhould determine our poſture to be this way onely directed, almoſt all theſe rules would thereby be infringed. For, not to ſpeake of the violation of Chriſtian libertie (if ſo it were determined) the three rules are all hereby violated, wee ſhall take them backward, the laſt firſt. *Sol.*

1. This were a ready way to breed and bring in *Superſtition* into the Church of God: For hereby ſome would, after a while, ſtudie religious reaſons, why their poſture ſhould bee this way directed, rather than any other way, and men (being naturally ſuperſtitious) would be apt to beleeve and entertaine them, *viz.* to thinke and eſteeme the *Table* as the *moſt Holy*, and *moſt preſentiall* place; And this we need not doubt, ſeeing we ſee it done already; From which errours, once entertained, many more ſuperſtitious conceits will follow, as we have ſhewed above.

2. It is a thing of *ill report*, and hath in it a plaine *appearance of*

evill; whereby it proveth ſcandalous and offenſive, both to weake Proteſtants, who thinke the men that doe it, to be idolatrous, and to ſtrong or weake Papiſts, who are confirmed in their Adoration of the Hoſt, becauſe they doe beleeve it to be farre more *holy* than the *Table*, and Chriſt *more preſent* there. And therefore whereas it is deſired by the 7. Canon of the late Synod, *That the rule of charity may be obſerved, that they which uſe this rite, deſpiſe not them who uſe it not, and that they who uſe it not, condemne not thoſe that uſe it*, We ſuppoſe they doe forget another rule of the Apoſtle, concerning the uſe of indifferent things; *They that are ſtrong ought to beare with the infirmities of the weake*, and not to pleaſe themſelves with diſpleaſing others; but to forbeare and reſtraine themſelves in their lawfull liberty, rather than to offend their brethren. And therefore we thinke they ought to bee ſo farre from deſpiſing them that uſe it not, that they themſelves ought not to uſe it, it being confeſſed an indifferent thing, and yet of evill report, and carrying with it a face and appearance of ſuperſtition, and laſtly, (which is not leaſt conſiderable) not yet determined by the Church. For though it be not in my power to neglect the uſe of a thing indifferent, if once commanded by the ſuperiour power; (as nor to uſe it if it be forbidden) yet when it is left every way indifferent in it ſelfe, and by the Church, In caſe of offence and ſcandall, I am bound to forbeare the uſe thereof; St. *Paul* was of this mind; *I will never eat fleſh whilſt the world ſtands, rather than offend my brethren*. Let others be alſo ſo minded.

3. It is a *breach of order*, and ſo of *decencie*, in the ſervice of God, which is ſo much pretended for it. For if the Church would order men in their poſture of Adoration, it were fitter to order it with reſpect to the place of the particular ſervice then in hand, as *towards* the *Font*, in time of Baptiſme; *towards* the *Pulpit*, in time of Prayer and Preaching; and *towards* the *Table*, in time of adminiſtration of the Lords Supper: And for this wee have a preſident or example for one particular; When our Saviour preached, it is ſaid, The eyes of all that were in the Synagogue were faſtened on him. It's very probable he ſtood in the midſt of the Synagogue, or neere unto it, not at any end thereof; Whereupon it followes that they could not all direct their poſture one way, ſome looked Eaſt, ſome Weſt, ſome North, ſome South: And this may be ſaid for this; That if it be not neceſſary for all the people to fix their eyes, and ſo their poſture upon the Miniſter, yet it is very

uk. 4. 20.
nd 19. laſt.
ἐκρέματο.
hey hanged
pon him for
heare him.

very uſefull ſo to doe, helping much to further attention, and to fix the words the more upon their hearts, and in their memories. And this is by experience found to be a good helpe to this purpoſe. Now let it further be conſidered, whether it be not *a breach of order*, for all the Congregation to direct their poſture one way, in time of preaching the Word, when God ſpeakes to us men, by the mouth of the Miniſter; and a breach of Decencie alſo, in as much as many muſt turne their backs upon the Miniſter, and conſequently upon God; And this cannot be avoided, if the Church ſhould determine all the Congregation to direct their poſture Eaſtward, or *towards* the *Table*, unleſſe the Pulpit alſo be removed into that part of the Church, which cannot be conveniently done in many, in moſt places. The like may be ſaid of the other particulars. In the time of adminiſtration of the Sacrament, we ſuppoſe it neceſſary or very convenient, and muſt for edification, that all the receivers ſhould have their eyes directed towards the Table, to behold the Conſecration and Sacramentall actions of breaking the Bread, *&c.* For which reaſon our Church hath ordered, that the Table ſhould at the time of adminiſtration of the Sacrament, ſtand in the body, that is, in the midſt of the Church or Chancell, that the people might come round about it, to behold the particulars before mentioned. Now, if the Church ſhould determine all men to worſhip Eaſtward (as ſome deſire) whilſt ſhe ſeemes to eſtabliſh Order, ſhe would manifeſtly breake it; for ſome muſt neceſſarily turne their backs upon the Table, (which would bee thought piacular and prophane) which I thinke cannot be done without breach of order and decencie too. There is no way to helpe this, but to ſet the Table cloſe by the end of the Chancell, leſt any man ſhould (as ſome abſurdly have ſaid) ſit above God Almighty. But then they fall into another inconvenience and greater miſchiefe, that they break the Rule of *Edification*, becauſe many, in many, or moſt Churches of this Kingdome, ſhall neither ſee nor heare the Conſecration, which is ſo neceſſarie.

To draw to a concluſion of this buſineſſe. If any man ſhall yet further ſay, It being lawfull for to worſhip God any way, when the Church hath not determined it, it may not ſeeme unlawfull if a man ſhall chooſe to direct his poſture of Adoration that way; For election of the place or part, towards which a man will direct his worſhip, cannot alter the nature of the worſhip, to make it willworſhip or ſuperſtitious. *Object.* 3.

My anſwer is partly made to this already, and further thus enlarged. *Sol.*

larged. Election of a place or part of the Church to direct our worſhip towards it, in reſpect of conveniencie, decencie, edification and the like, as in reſpect of ſuch circumſtances as may further the worſhip, doth not indeed alter the nature of the worſhip, or corrupt it; ſuch a part or place being rather of Gods chooſing than our owne. For the Scriptures, & the Law of conſcience within, command us to make ſuch choice of place (and time) as may better our worſhip. But to rule our election of part or place, to adore or worſhip God, by any ſuch circumſtance as hath not any influence into the worſhip, to better or further it, in him that doth performe it, but onely ſuch as is founded upon the device of man, and ends in ſuperſtition, is an unlawfull election. For example; Suppoſe there were in the Church, an Image or Crucifix in the end of the Chancell upon the wall or window, (as in ſome there is, and ſome of late ſet up) it is no doubt as lawfull for a man to bow to God that way as any other, if it were done without all reſpect unto that part or thing; But if any man ſhall chuſe to bow that way, rather than any other, before thoſe Images, I ſuppoſe it were ſimply unlawfull, becauſe he regulates his choice of place or part by ſuch a circumſtance as doth no way further him in that act of worſhip, but directly tends both to further the Idolatrous Papiſt, in his worſhip of or by an Image, and alſo ſcandalize thoſe that are weake, and himſelfe incurres the ſuſpition (or appearance) of Idolatry. The ſame inconveniences falling upon the choice of the Table, to be the part or place towards which we direct our adoration, Wee may conclude, that ſuch election is unlawfull. To cleare my ſelfe, and ſhut up all; It is lawfull, yea, perhaps neceſſary, in the time of adminiſtration of the Sacrament, to chooſe to direct our Adoration *towards* the *Table*, or rather *towards* the *Sacrament*, as much conducing to further our worſhip: but ſo it is as lawfull, and neceſſary to direct it *towards* the *Pulpit* in the time of preaching; the reaſon of both was given afore; But for a man to chuſe to direct his worſhip *towards* the *Table*, when there is no Sacrament there, or with thoſe religious reſpects of *more holineſſe* in, and more *ſpeciall preſence* of God at that place than any other, this we thinke to be ſuperſtitious; And to this our diſcourſe is chiefly directed.

I had thought I had now done and anſwered all, But meeting with another pretence for this *Adoration towards* the *Altar*, to remove (as the Author ſpeakes) the ſtumbling block of theſe times, of bowing *towards the communion Table*, out of the way of all well affected

affected people; I could not let it paſſe without ſome obſervation. Thus he ſayes; *The Table being amongſt conſecrated things, either it acquires ſomething by vertue of its Conſecration, or elſe the action of the Church is not onely void, but alſo vaine and idle, which no man will (I thinke) affirme. That which the Conſecration conferres, cannot be any reall qualitie of holineſſe, for of this it is not capable: it muſt needs be therefore onely a fitneſſe or aptneſſe in the thing conſecrated, to worke upon the minds and underſtandings of men, conſidering it as Conſecrated. And is nothing elſe, but an aptitude to ſtirre them up to holy thoughts, upon thoſe things repreſented, and acted upon that holy place, which multiplying themſelves, doe at laſt breake forth into the act of holy worſhip, &c. The Table is onely a memorative inſtrument, unto which the aſſiſtance of grace is never wanting, either to beget in our minds ſuch thoughts of the death of Chriſt; or to extract from our perſons ſuch a worſhip of him, if we be not otherwiſe wanting to our ſelves.* G. Iron. 7. queſt. of Sab. p. 279.

To which I have many things to ſay. Firſt, the *Conſecration* it ſelfe, now challenged and practiſed by the Church, is juſtly queſtionable. By what law of God or man (except the popiſh Canon law) is *Conſecration* of Churches, or of things thereto belonging, juſtified? Who gave the *BB.* this authoritie, to *Conſecrate*, that is, to transfuſe any ſuch vertue or efficacie into the things *conſecrated*, to worke thus upon mens minds to ſtirre up in them acceptable devotion? which is peculiar unto God. And, I pray, how doth hee juſtifie this effectuall *conſecration*, but from *Cajetane*, and the Romiſh ſchooles? Sol.

Secondly, the *Table* being amongſt *conſecrated* things, and but one of them, why is this efficacie more given to it, than to the *Font* or *Pulpit*, (or *Bell-ropes* if they be *conſecrated*) and why are other *conſecrated* things neglected? Surely they may take it ill, to bee ſo ſlighted. Why may they not juſtifie their *bowing* to the *Font*, &c. as well as to the *Table*, upon the ſame reaſon?

Thirdly, the *Conſecration* of the Church or Table, &c. if it be ſuppoſed to be any more, than a meere ſeparation of them to ſacred uſes, during the decencie, convenience, &c. is not onely void, and vaine and idle, but ſuperſtitious alſo, derogatorie to the prerogative of God, who alone can effectually *conſecrate* things or places, to that purpoſe which is here pretended.

Fourthly, but let us conſider, what (he ſayes) the *conſecration* doth conferre: not any reall holineſſe, of that, the Table is not capable: what then? any relative holineſſe? nor that, it ſeemes:

why then is it called a *conſecrated* thing? yet relative holineſſe, if properly ſo called, is proper and peculiar unto God, as wee have ſhewed above. What is it then that the *Conſecration* conferres? Nothing elſe but an aptitude or fitneſſe to ſtirre up mens minds to holy thoughts, conſidering it as *conſecrated*. But firſt, is not this groſſe popiſh ſuperſtition, as if it were in the power of humane *conſecration* to infuſe into the things *conſecrated* an aptitude to ſtir up holy thoughts in the minds of men? The *Temple and Altar conſecrated* by God did no more. If therefore the ground bee naught, the devotion cannot be good, nor the worſhip holy. Secondly, the *Table* (he ſayes) is a *memorative inſtrument*, unto which the aſſiſtance of grace is never wanting, either to beget in our minds ſuch thoughts, or to extract from our perſons ſuch worſhip, if we be not otherwiſe wanting unto our ſelves: But who made the *Table* a *memorative inſtrument*, with aſſiſtance of grace to wait upon it? Not God for certaine, he hath no where promiſed his aſſiſting grace ſhall wait upon the *Table*, or any thing of meere humane *conſecration*. Not men, it is too much arrogance and preſumption, for men to take upon them the diſpenſation of grace, to ſtirre up ſuch thoughts, to extract ſuch worſhip. And therefore ſuch devotion ſo ſtirred up, ſuch worſhip ſo extracted from the conſideration of the things as *conſecrated* by men, makes it ſo farre from being acceptable to God, that if we thinke to have grace attend upon the uſe of this meanes, it will make it abominable. Such devotion deſcends not from above, but is earthly, carnall, and ſuperſtitious; And ſo I leave it.

Chap. IV.

Concerning private Devotion in a Church.

Superſtition, as well as true Religion, is very fruitfull of concluſions, with this difference, beſides others, that truth hath limits, but errour and ſuperſtition hath none, but one being granted, a thouſand follow after. There is (as I take it) another branch of Superſtition ſpringing from the ſame root; That men, whenſoever they goe into a Church at any time, fall downe on their knees (as neere the *Altar* as they dare) and there put forth their private prayers. If they will give no reaſon of this their practiſe, as it is not λογικὴ λατρεία, a reaſonable ſervice, as it ought to

Rom. 12.1.

bee,

bee, so it gives a strong suspition of hypocrisie and vain-glory, as it did in the Pharisees of old, who prayed in the Synagogues and corners of the streets, to be seene of men; And if they will vouchsafe to give a reason, I suppose it is the same that is afore given for the former practises, *viz.* a conceit of *more Holinesse*, and more *speciall presence of God there* than in other places, which is the reason rendred for the generall reverence pleaded for in the first corollary; Now that this is also grossely superstitious will thus appeare. If there be no more *holinesse*, nor more *speciall presence* of God, in the Church, than in other places, our houses, closets, chambers, *&c.* then to pray privately in a publike place with that opinion is grosly superstitious. But the first hath beene proved true in the former discourse, *ergo*.

For the better satisfaction of some in this particular, there may a double question be moved. The first is this; Seeing it is granted lawfull, not onely by us, but by the Apostle himselfe, to pray, *ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ*, in every, in any place, why may it not bee also as lawfull to pray privately in a Church, though it be a publike place, as in any other place. *Object.* 1.

To this I answer, 1. If the *Church* be considered as a place meerely, without any *Religious respect* put upon it, *viz.* of more *Holinesse*, more *speciall presence*, or more effectuall to adde vertue to our prayers, it is as lawfull to pray there, as in any other place. 2. But then I adde these cautions; This must be, when either a man is alone, that he may not incurre suspition of vain-glory, or else hath just occasion offered him, now whilest he is in that place, to pray to God, *e. g.* If a man lived in a place where he had no conveniencie to be solitarie, to performe his private devotions, if hee opportunely meet with libertie of a Church, I doubt not, but he may lawfully take it: or thus, Suppose a man were forced to lye all night in a Church; hee might as lawfully commend himselfe to God by prayer, evening and morning there, as in his closet or chamber, considering it onely as a place fit and convenient for the purpose, without those former religious respects. But thus he might also pray in the *fields*, yea, in the streets, in the greatest concourse of people, as *Steven* did, when they came all about him, to stone him, He kneeled down and prayed, *&c.* and so did *Paul* and his Companions upon the shore ready to depart. *Sol.*

The other question may be this: Suppose the Assembly bee come together, and the service of God now in act, then you yeeld the *Object.* 2.

place *more holy*, and God more *ſpecially preſent* there. Now ſuppoſe alſo, a man is caſt behind, whether by negligence, or ſome juſt occaſion, whether is it lawfull for him, when hee firſt comes into the Church, to proſtrate himſelfe, and fall to his private devotions, to prepare (as is pretended) for the publike Service. It ſhould ſeeme he lawfully may; For if it be therefore unlawfull to pray privately in a Church, becauſe there is no more *Holineſſe*, no more *ſpeciall preſence* of God there; then, when there is both theſe, it may ſeeme to be lawfull.

Sol. To this I anſwer many things, yeelding the Antecedent, and denying the conſequence: For, in publike worſhip, all the rules of worſhip muſt be obſerved, and a man cannot make amends for one fault, by making another. Now in this practiſe there are many faults meet; as

As in *Sauls* caſe, 1 *Sam.* 13. 11. 12 not much unlike.

1. The not attending on the beginning of publike Service, for then hee might have joyned with the Congregation in proſtration and prayer, *&c.* And this no doubt, this late comming to the publike Service, is one cauſe of this diſorder.

2. The next fault is, the want of preparation before hee came, which ought for to have beene done, *Eccleſ.* 5. 1. *Take heed to thy foot when thou entereſt*, that is before thou entereſt, not when thou art entered, for then *thou muſt be more readie to heare*; that is, to joyne with the Congregation; I forbeare to adde the reſt.

So *G. I.* of Sab. p. 267. Few men I thinke, &c See alſo p. 268. ſecondly.

3. But a worſe fault is this, a breach of *Order* and *decencie*, in regard of the place which is appointed for publike, and not for private worſhip; the houſe or chamber is for that, *Math.* 6. Now as it is held, and indeed is, a breach of Order, in peaceable times of the Church, when places are appointed for that end, to have publike meetings and ſervice in private houſes: So it muſt bee confeſſed a breach of Order alſo, to make private prayer in a publike place.

4. Laſtly, but there is yet a worſe fault than this, The breach of *Order* and *Decencie* in the *publike Service*, which ſhould be Uniforme and unanimous. People ſhould come together, depart together, pray together, heare, ſing, reade together, which is ſtrongly and juſtly pleaded for. And I cannot but wonder, that they, who ſtand ſo much for *Vniformitie*, *Order*, and *decencie* in the ſervice of God, ſhould ſo much forget and tranſgreſſe their owne Rule, as both to juſtifie and practiſe this *Deformitie* and *diſorder*, as when they come into the Church, in time of publike Service, to betake themſelves to their private devotions. I leave them to conſider it.

To

To conclude this buſineſſe. Though we doe grant, that *proſtration* and *kneeling*, and *other geſtures of reverence*, be now lawfull, according to the particular Services in hand, yet wee affirme, they muſt be uſed with obſervation of that generall Rule, *Let all things* (in the Church eſpecially) *be done decently, and in Order.*

A Cenſure of certaine Aſſertions of Dr. M. *concerning Bowing before the Altar.*

THe particulars here following, are part of a Letter (as it ſhould ſeeme) written by the Dr. to a friend, concerning his *Bowing towards* or *before* the *Altar*. And the beginning of his diſcourſe, is (as I take it) an anſwer to an objection made againſt it, by his friend, to this effect: That there is little or no difference between his *Adoration towards* or *before* the *Altar*, and Papiſts adoration *towards, before*, or *by* an *Image*. To this he anſwers.

SECT. I.

To worſhip God by an Image, and to worſhip him, towards ſome place or Monument of his preſence, are things of a farre different nature. For the one is abſolutely forbidden by the divine Law, and the other we find continually practiſed by his people, with his allowance and approvement. Thus in the Wilderneſſe they worſhipped him towards the cloud, as the monument of his preſence going with them, Exod. 33 10. & 34 58.

To this I would reply by way of diſtinction. An Image may bee taken either ſtrictly for a Statue or Picture, or largely for any ſimilitude uſed in divine worſhip, and that either by divine or humane inſtitution. If the Dr. take it in the firſt ſence I grant his Aſſertion true; there is a difference betweene them, and the reaſon lyes faire, in Gods prohibition of the one, and allowance at leaſt of the other. But if he take it in the ſecond ſence, and for a ſimilitude of Divine inſtitution, there is little or no difference betweene them; For ſuch an Image or ſimilitude is a place or monument of his Preſence, by vertue of his promiſe, to be preſent with his people, in the uſe of his owne ordinances. On the other ſide, if he take it for a ſimilitude or Image of mans inſtitution (which is, when any *place* or *thing* is made, and eſteemed *more holy*, and God *more preſent there*) it is all one, and little or no difference there is, betweene *adoration before*

an *Image*, and *adoration before* ſuch a *place*, or *thing*, made by men a Monument of his preſence. As ſhall appeare hereafter.

Sect. II.

In the Tabernacle and Temple, they directed their poſture towards the Arke of Covenant, or mercy Seat, as the Throne and foot-ſtoole, Pſal. 99.5. & 132.7.28. & Pſ.5.17 — *When they were abſent from the Temple, they turned their faces towards the ſame, when they prayed or worſhipped,* 1 King.8.44.48. Dan.6.10.

To this ſecond Section thus wee reply. In the Tabernacle or Temple, they directed not onely their poſture, but their act of worſhip, (as the Dr. diſtinguiſhes Sect.6.) which is more, *towards* the *Arke* or *Mercy Seat*, as the Throne or Foot-ſtoole; The reaſons were, 1. becauſe thoſe were ſimilitudes of Gods owne inſtitution, (as the *Temple* and *Altar* alſo were) Similitudes, I ſay, and Types of Chriſt, and *media* of worſhip, appointed for thoſe times, to ſignifie that all worſhip was, and is to bee directed to God, by and through Chriſt. 2. Becauſe God was pleaſed there continually to reſide, and there to exhibite his preſence to that people. Both which reaſons are wanting to our *Tables*, as in the Application will appeare.

Sect III.

And all this may ſeeme (for ought that can be alledged to the contrary) Ex more generis humani, *without any new or peculiar precept, which is nowhere to be knowne; Nature having taught them, as in their addreſſes to men to looke upon their face, ſo in their addreſſes to divine Majeſty, to accommodate their poſtures to ſomething, where his preſence was more declared than elſe where, whether as in the Heavens, or as in the Temple, or other ſacred places, and Monuments of his Preſence.*

That all this was done meerely *ex more generis humani*, is partly falſe; For *Deut.*26 3.10. there is expreſſe command, that the offerer, preſenting his offering to the Prieſt, ſhould leave it there, *before the Altar*, and bow himſelfe *before the Lord*. And beſides, there was a mutuall ſtipulation betweene God and *Solomon*, that when any did pray *towards* the *Temple*, though farre off, that God ſhould heare in heaven, which is equivalent to a precept. As for the Heathen

then in their addreſſes to their Gods, they had reſpect of their Images or Altars, to which they had confined the preſence of their Gods. Therefore apprehending them there to be preſent more than in other places, no matvell if they did accommodate their poſtures to that place. Nature indeed may teach men, that where God exhibites his preſence, thitherward the worſhip may bee directed; But I ſuppoſe, no Chriſtian will confine Chriſts *preſence*, more to the *Table*, than to any other part of the Church; when there is no Sacrament there at the leaſt: And therefore this will little helpe the buſineſſe.

Sect. IV.

Hence it appeares, that to worſhip God, Verſus locum preſentiæ, *or towards the place where his perſon is any where ſpecified, is no Idolatry, or forbidden in the ſecond Commandement. For that which was no Idolatry in the old Teſtament, ſurely can be none in the New, what ever faults may be otherwiſe.*

Hence it appeares indeed, that to worſhip God, *Verſus locum præſentiæ*, &c. is no Idolatry; but hence it is ſuſpected, that the Doctor begges the queſtion, in taking for granted, that the *Table* is *locus præſentiæ*, when there is no Sacrament; Nor is his reaſon annexed generally true. For that may be Idolatry or ſuperſtition in the New Teſtament, which was none in the Old, *e.g.* If a man ſhould now worſhip God *toward Jeruſalem*, or the *Temple* there, (with opinion of *Holineſſe*, or *ſpeciall preſence* of God there, to make his prayer more accepted, *&c.*) it were no doubt, Idolatry or ſuperſtition, becauſe thoſe are now ceaſed to be meanes of worſhip.

Sect. V.

The reaſon of this difference of worſhipping God by an Image, and worſhipping towards ſome place, where his preſence is ſpecified, is this; becauſe in the former, the creature is uſed objectively, in the act of Divine worſhip, in the other not ſo.

This reaſon aſſigned by the Doctor, of the difference betweene the things propoſed, *viz.* that in the one the creature is uſed objectively, in the other not ſo, is moſt unſound. For firſt Papiſts themſelves doe not, or ſay they doe not uſe the Image objectively, as terminating their worſhip ultimately thereon; but ſay they worſhip God

God or Chriſt, *by, before, through,* or *towards* the *Image.* 2. They that worſhip God *toward* or *before* the *Table,* as the Throne of Majeſtie, as the moſt holy, and moſt preſentiall place, doe as much uſe the creature objectively, making the Table *objectum mediatum & relativum,* of the worſhip, as they that worſhip God by an Image, and where is then the difference? The true ground of the difference was given before, becauſe the former is forbidden by the ſecond Commandement, the other not, but rather commanded. For he that forbids us to make an Image, and to worſhip it, or by it, doth not barre himſelfe from making Images or ſimilitudes of his own worſhip, or from requiring us to worſhip him, in, by, or through the ſame. Yea, the affirmative part of that ſecond Commandement ſuppoſes both theſe; 1. Thou ſhalt worſhip God, 2. in, or by, his owne preſcribed Images.

Sect. VI.

For take notice that the creature may be uſed in Divine worſhip, either per modum objecti, *in reſpect of the act of worſhipping; or* per modum inſtrumenti, *or circumſtance onely. The firſt without queſtion is Idolatry, for the Lord our God is a jealous God, and cannot endure that any created thing ſhould partake with him, by way of object, in the worſhip given him. But he that adhibits an Image in the act of Worſhip, if he attend it as an Image, makes it an object, not of his poſture onely, which any other creature might, but of his act alſo, becauſe hee adhibits it as a repreſentation of the object, whereunto his worſhip is directed, and conſequently as an object repreſentative, whereon this Act firſt reflecting, paſſeth to the Archetype, which though it be no more, than to make it* objectum mediatum, *or* relativum, *not* abſolutum & ultimum, *yet is it more than Gods jealouſie will endure. But as for the other, to uſe a creature in the act of worſhip by way of inſtrument or circumſtance, I meane of time or place, is not unlawfull.*

There is in this Section a threefold diſtinction, which being diſtinctly cleared, will give good light to the preſent buſineſſe, 1. The creature may be uſed in divine worſhip, either objectively, or inſtrumentally and circumſtantially: Inſtrumentally or circumſtantially, when the creature is uſed meerely as a creature, without any Religious reſpect put upon it; Objectively, when the act of worſhip is ſome way or other terminated in the creature. 2. When the creature

creature is used objectively, it may be considered, either as the object of our act of worship, or as the object of our posture onely; but this distinction is coincident with the former, and almost the same; For to make the creature the object of our posture onely, is to use the creature onely circumstantially; 3. When the creature is used as the object of the act of worship, that is of our worship it selfe, it may admit of this distinction; It is used either as the absolute and ultimate object of our worship, or relatively and mediately, as Papists doe distinguish, to avoid the censure of Idolatry, in worshipping of Images. Now apply this to our present cause; The Doctor acknowledges, that to use the creature, as an object of our act of worship, whether absolutely or relatively, is Idolatrous, because it makes the creature to partake with God in his worship, by way of object, which God can not endure, no not when it is made *objectum mediatum*, or *relativum*; that is, when it is made an object representative of the Archetype, to which the worship is directed. But now I shall adde my assumption to his proposition; thus; he adhibits the *Table*, in the act of divine worship, as an object representative, or as a representation of the object whereunto his worship is directed, (as they doe, who adhibit or use it, with attending it, as the *most holy*, and *most pressentiall place*) that man uses a creature objectively, relatively, if not absolutely; mediatly, if not ultimately; making it not onely the object of his Posture, which any other creature, any other part of the Church might be, but also of his act; Therefore it is Idolatrous, and more than Gods jealousie can endure, in the Doctors owne words. But we proceed.

SECT. VII.

First, it is not unlawfull to use the creature per modum instrumenti, *for then it will not be lawfull, to use a booke when we pray, or sing, or give thankes unto God; or to use a Table or Chalice in the celebration of the holy Communion, &c.*

It is, no question, lawfull to use the Creature in divine worship by way of instrument. But I appeale the Doctors wisdome and ingenuitie, whether, when he bowes *towards* or *before* the *Table*, as *Solium Christi*, or as a *place most holy*, and *representative of Christs presence*, &c. he use the *Table* onely by way of instrument. We doe indeed so use it, when we use it, to hold the elements, which are consecrated thereupon. But if they put any religious respects upon

it, as *Scalam Christi, Throne of Majestie, presentiall place*, &c. What doe they lesse than Papists, in worshipping God or Christ, *by* or *before an Image*; who (as they say themselves) exhibit the Image onely as an object representative, not terminating their worship ultimately therein, but using it as a representation of the object, and consequently as an object representative, whereon the Act of worship first reflecting, passeth to the Archetypo. If yet they will say, they use the *Table* with those respects had unto it, *per modum instrumenti*, they may goe on, and say, The Iewes used the *Arke, Temple, Cloud*, &c. when they bowed *towards* them, onely by way of instrument. And by the same reason or distinction, they may bow not onely *before* the *Font* or *Pulpit*, but also *before* a *Crucifix* or *Image*, and say, they use them not, *per modum objecti*, but onely *per modum instrumenti*.

Sect. VIII.

Secondly, not per modum circumstantiæ loci aut temporis; *for then it should not bee lawfull to use Oratories or Churches to worship in, or any certaine place therein, appointed for the Priest to officiate in; or to appoint any certaine dayes or times to worship God in, as Sundayes and Holy-dayes; But all those, our practise shewes, we esteeme lawfull*, &c.

As for this second part of the Application of the distinction, it is answered as the former; and further, thus; It is lawfull to use Churches, as also houses, closets, fields, &c. to worship God in; To choose dayes or times convenient also for that purpose; that is, as places, or as times meerely considered. But to worship God *towards* any *place*, or *in* any *time*, (if he have not appointed any such) as *more holy*, or *efficacious to our worship*, is a groundlesse, vaine, and superstitious practice. All *places*, *qua places*, are alike indifferent, and meere circumstances of worship. But to worship God, with relation or respect to such a *place* as *more holy*, or as a representation of his presence, is more by much, than to use it by way of circumstance, even to make it *objectum medianum*, or *relativum* of our worship, and by the Doctors owne conclusion, more than Gods jealousie can endure.

Sect. IX.

If then it be lawfull to use a creature for the ubi, *or place where, why not also*, versus quem, ubi & quo *being alike indifferent circumstances of place? And if this should not be lawfull, then would it bee*

sinne,

seems, also, to lift up our hands and eyes to heaven: or if the determination of our posture only, by a creature, to worship, be Idolatry, why might we not justly scruple, lest the posture of our face and hands to heaven-ward, might make us guilty of worshipping the host of heaven, sunne, &c. as Idolaters did.

By that which hath beene said already, this conclusion need not to be feared. For if we make them objects of our posture only, there is no scruple, of being Idolatrous, in so doing: But if wee should make them objects of our worship, although but mediatly or relatively, as putting *more holinesse*, or *efficacie* in them, or in our posture, by Gods or mans institution, I suppose the Doct. would not deny, but wee were superstitious, whether others suspected us so, or no. And this is their very case, or I understand not what they meane, when they call the *table*, the *Throne of Christ*, *most holy place*, &c. Although this also may be added, that Christs corporall presence is certainly confined to the heavens, by the Scriptures: and therefore to lift up our hands and eyes to heaven there is good reason, yet as meere circumstances of our worship. For if we pray, as the Publican did, with hands hanging down, and eyes dejected to the ground, yet should our Prayers be no lesse accepted. But they dare not yet say, Christs bodily presence is more confined to the Table, than to other parts of the Church.

SECT. 10.

And for our security herein, our blessed Saviour hath taught us, to say, in the Lords Prayer, which he hath left us the Church, Our Father which art in heaven, &c. For without question, if we may determine the divine presence thus, in our speech, we may doe it likewise, at the same time in our Posture; which is no more, than to expresse that visibly, by our gesture, which we utter vocally with our mouthes.

This instruction of our Saviour, in the Lords Prayer, both justifies and secures us, in lifting up our hands and eyes to heaven. But when the Doctor would infer, that, if we may determine the divine presence thus in our speech, we may doe it, at the same time in our posture, he speaks both incongruously, and impertinently in my judgement. First incongruously: for 1. we determine not the divine presence to heaven, but God himselfe, and Christ hath done it, if it be done. 2. wee may indifferently determine our posture to-

wards heaven, or any other place, as place, but to make that *place*, or that *posture* (as wee said) *more holy* and *efficacious to our prayers*, that wee take to be superstitious, and little better than Idolatrous. Secondly, the Doctor speaks impertinently to the cause in hand; for though wee grant that it is lawfull for us to determine our *posture* thither, where God hath pleased to determine his owne *presence*; yet wee denie, that it is lawfull for us to determine the divine *presence*, to what *place* we please, and then to determine our *posture* of worship *towards* that *place*, with that religious respect. And this the Doctor must prove, or he does nothing.

Sect. 11.

Now therefore to apply this to the Hypothesis. The Table *or* Altar *(for the difference is meerely verball) in our Christian Churches, answers to the* Ark *or* mercy seat *in the Jewish Temple, being* solium Christi, *and accordingly by antiquity, was accounted of, as* oculus Ecclesiæ, *and the* most sacred thing; *as the place where the booke of the holy Gospell, by antient custome, lay, parallel to the 2 Tables; The pot of Manna, to the holy Eucharist, that is, the sacred monument of the New Testament, as those of the old Covenant. Why may not then the like respect be had to it, in the posture of our sacred Adoration, which the Jewes, in theirs, had, not onely to the* Ark, *but to the* Altar, *which stood before it, even to the* Temple *it selfe, when they could not come to performe their adoration there, as aforesaid.*

In this Section, the Doctor beggs the question more than once; First in generall, to say, that our Christian *Churches* must answer to the old *temple*: whereas their *temple* being in all parts of it Typicall, was to end in Christ, the Antitype; and therefore ours should be as little like theirs, as may be. 2. In speciall, to say, that our *table* must answer to their *Ark*, or *mercy seat*; nay rather, if to any thing, to their *table* of *shew-bread*, as I would think; but to their *Altar* rather, if they would speak congruously to their owne way; for so they should find a parallel to their *Altar*. 3. He begs againe, in saying, The *table* is the *most sacred thing*: For wee denie the *table* to be *more sacred extrinsecum*, than other parts of the Church: And in the use, the booke of the Gospell layd upon it, or the Holy elements consecrated, are *more holy* than the *table*; Why then may not the *holy elements*, if any be left, challenge to be the most *sacred thing*, and be reserved, and so adoration tendered *towards them*, rather than

towards

he forme of rship being anged, it was pedient, e the out-rd circum-ances of ce, and so-me times, ould be dif-ent from hat they were fore B of E. cat. of Sab. 269.

towards the *table*? 4. He begs once more, in saying, the *table* is *solium Christi*, or *oculus Ecclesiæ*. For what ever Antiquity pleased to speak, in their wanton and transcendent metaphors, Christ is not represented on the *table*, as in his Majestie (for which a Throne is necessary) but as in his lowest humility, broken, crucified, &c. for which a Crosse were fitter than a Throne. And if any shall say, why the very Crosse was Christs Throne, on which he did triumph, as the Apostle speaks; there is a faire way opened now, to introduce a Crucifix to be hung over the Table, (as some where it is done) and then adoration pleaded for, towards that, as *solium Christi*, &c. 5. If our *table* represent their *Arke*, our *Churches* may also represent their *temple*, and why may not the like respect be tendered to them, as to the *temple*, to pray *towards* them, when we are far from them. Lastly then, his question is easily answered, The like respect may not be shewed to our *table*, in our Posture of Adoration, which the Jewes shewed to their *Arke*, *Altar*, *Temple*, &c. because they were *media* of worship, of Gods owne ordination: ours onely instruments of *decencie* and *conveniencie*, of humane institution.

Sect. 12.

Lastly, all Nations and Religions have beene wont to use some reverentiall gesture, when they entred into their Temples. *And our Saviour in the Gospell, would not have his Disciples enter into an house without salutation*, Math. 10. 12. *Then why should not we think it a part of religious manners to doe as much, when we enter into the house of God. Now of all gestures in adoration, bowing the body seems to be the most comely, and ready for that purpose, and of all postures therein (and some gestures there must needs be) that is the best, which is directed* towards *that which is* sacred, *and* of most eminent relation to God *in the Church, being the holy* Table *or* Altar.

We are now drawing to the conclusion; and this wee have to say, 1. That the Gentiles used some reverentiall gestures when they entered into their *temples*, the reason was shewed afore; because they confined their Gods to their *temples*, which whosoever should imagine of the *table*, should be ridiculous, to say no more. 2. Our Saviours direction for civill salutations makes no rule (but fallible) to order our Religious worship by, when we come into our Churches; but wee must have recourse to the revealed will of God. 3. Religious manners require no more of us (for ought I know) but

that wee doe not profane the places and things imployed to Gods ſervice: But that they require any poſitive reverence, (not having divine ſanctification) is yet to prove. 4. It is therefore another miſerable begging, to ſay, there muſt be ſome religious poſture or geſture uſed, when we enter into our Churches: unleſſe the ſervice of God be then in hand, and then the poſture muſt be ſuteble (as much as may conveniently be) to the particular kind of worſhip, then in being; if at prayers, kneeling: if reading, preaching, or ſinging, ſitting, or ſtanding reverently, &c. 5. To ſay, that of all *poſtures*, that is beſt, which is directed *towards* that which is *ſacred*, and of *moſt eminent relation to God, &c.*, is a concluſion like the premiſſes. For 1. it is taken for granted, which is denied, that the *table* is the *moſt ſacred* and *of moſt eminent Relation to God*: for which they can alledge no divine inſtitution. 2. If that be the beſt *poſture* which is directed *towards* that which is *ſacred*: then any other poſture, or geſture ſo directed, might be beſt, as well as bowing. If hee ſay, that is moſt ready, and moſt comely, he begs to the very end, and ſo will doe (I think) everlaſtingly, or elſe hee cannot maintaine his cauſe.

M. M. — *A ſurvay of another Letter, written by a learned Authour concerning the ſame things*

AFter I had finiſhed the former diſcourſe and cenſure, I light upon another Letter of a learned man touching the ſame matters, which becauſe it containes ſomething not inſiſted on by others, and alſo hath prevailed much with ſome (out of reverence and reſpect to the Authour) to ſway them, not onely to the opinion, but the practiſe alſo of the things in queſtion, I thought it very neceſſarie to conſider briefly, the ſtrength and reaſon of what hee writes. Wherein I ſhall proceed, as in the former, taking onely the ſumme and ſubſtance of the particulars, without tranſcription of the whole.

SECT. I.

Concerning Holineſſe of Churches.

Relative Holineſſe (of which places are onely capable) is nothing elſe but a ſtate of Relation of peculiaritie to God-wards, either in reſpect of preſence, or propriety & Dominion; of preſence, when God is after a peculiar manner preſent, as when he appeared to Moſes in the flaming

noting both, Exod. 3. 5. *Of proprietie, when a thing being dedicated, or consecrated to the Divine Majestie, the propriete thereof becomes so his, as it is no longer ours. For that to be Gods, is to be his in a peculiar manner, and not as other things are; For otherwise it is true, the whole earth is the Lords, and the fulnesse thereof*, &c.

In answer whereunto, these things are very considerable: First, his definition or description of *Relative Holinesse* may bee admitted, if he speake of *Relative holinesse, properly* so called; For it is some learned use for to distinguish. *Relative Holinesse is, in respect of destination to the use of holy things: And that relation proceeds either from Divine or humane Institution; If it be done by God, it is true and proper relative holinesse, in respect of the Divine will; if by men, holinesse cannot any wayes be attributed, but onely in respect of the (holy) things done in them.* Where these things are to be noted, 1. That he makes no *relative Holinesse*, in respect of *Divine presence*, but onely in respect of *divine destination* or institution. 2. That he makes *divine institution* only to make things *properly* holy: *humane, very improperly*, if at all, onely with respect to the ends and uses of them, to holy imployments, which this Authour takes no notice of. If hee speake of *proper holinesse*, that indeed is a *relation of peculiaritie to Godwards*: For his *Consecration*, or sanctification being nothing else, but a separation of things to his owne uses, must needs produce such a peculiaritie or proprietie, as that they are no longer ours. But if he intend it of *humane dedication*, or consecration (as I thinke he doth) the question is too boldly begged, to say, that that makes any such peculiaritie, or gives such a proprietie unto God, that the things are perpetually his, and may never bee alienated unto other uses, as shall appeare anon. D. Rivet. in Exod. 20 p. 202. 1 & 2.

Secondly, his distinction of things *Relatively holy*, either in respect of *divine presence*, or *proprietie*, is not distinct enough. For the presence of God being diversly exhibited, may also be distinguished into *sensible, Symbolicall*, and *spirituall*; Whereas this Authour by the instance that he gives of Gods extraordinary, sensible, visible apparition in the bush to *Moses*, seemes to take no notice of the rest, and to thinke that this *presence* onely makes a *place* to be *holy*; If so, he is first deceived; for the *Symbolicall presence* also made the *Temple holy*: and secondly, that kind of presence being not now extant, is nothing to his purpose, which is to prove Holinesse in our Churches, where no such presence can be found.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, whereas he ſeemes to ſay, That *dedication* or conſecration of a thing to the divine Majeſtie, gives God ſuch a *proprietie*, that the thing becomes ſo his, as it is no longer ours: this is contrary to the Churches practiſe if he ſpeak of *humane dedication*. For it is evident that *Churches* themſelves *dedicated* to holy uſes, and other things thereunto belonging, have ceaſed to be Gods, and conſequently to be holy, and have returned unto common uſes, that is, to bee ours againe. Nay more than ſo, Things *conſecrated by God*, that is, by his inſtitution, now under the Goſpell, after the uſe is over, doe returne againe to be ours, and common; as for example; the *water* after Baptiſme, the *bread* and *wine* after the Lords Supper is ended, according to the judgement and practice of all reformed Churches. Therefore *Humane dedication* or conſecration doth much leſs give God ſuch *proprietie*, as that things ſo become his, that they are no longer ours.

Fourthly, it is point a worthy a further ſerious conſideration, whether *Humane dedication*, or conſecration, doe give any ſuch *proprietie* to God, in *things dedicated*, as that they doe become ſo his, that they are no longer ours. And upon this, the *Holineſſe* of them now pleaded for doth depend: For things are therefore ſaid to be *holy*, becauſe they are Gods by ſpeciall *proprietie* and ſeparation of them to him; not therefore Gods, becauſe they are made Holy. Hence it is, that whereas in the law of the firſt borne, it is ſaid, *Exod.* 13. 2. It ſhall be mine: In the Goſpell, *Luk.* 2. 23. it is ſaid, it ſhall be *holy* to the Lord: And ſo in the law of Tythes, *Levit.* 27. 30. All the Tythes of the land are the Lords, *holy* to the Lord: Firſt *appropriated* unto him, and then conſequently *holy*, that is, ſo his, that they are no longer ours. Now the queſtion is, whether *humane conſecration* or dedication doth make things *properly* Gods, and conſequently *holy*: For the reſolution whereof, that which hath already been ſaid, conduces much; *viz.* the practice of the Church and State, alienating things and places, dedicated by men, to other uſes, than firſt they were devoted to: which argues, that in their judgement, there is no ſuch *propriety* given to God, that the things doe ſo become his, as that they are no longer ours: But this is an argument *a poſteriori*, and perhaps the practice may be unlawfull; at leaſt this man, and his copartners muſt, for once, ſay ſo: wee will therefore argue it a little further. And thus wee doe proceed unto ſome conſiderations and proofes about it.

In thoſe places and things there is ſuch a relative propriety, as never ceaſes, but makes them alwayes holy, and alwayes his, to whom they be dedicated, and ſet apart. *Swann. Reddo debitum.* p. 124.

1. *Conſid.* 1. In the times of the Law, God had *propriety* by a double right, firſt his owne authoritative *appropriation* of them to himſelfe. 2. By

Iunitary

voluntary dedication by the people. For there were not onely Sacrifices commanded by God, but free-will offerings also devoted by the people. And these latter sort (as well as the former) were so made Gods, and consequently holy, that they were no longer theirs, nor might be alienated, without expresse licence from God, upon such conditions as he was pleased to prescribe: which are evidently to be found in *Levit.* 27. where there are many Lawes, for the redemption of their Tithes, and things voluntarily devoted and sanctified by the people.

2. The reason of the *holinesse* of things freely *devoted*, stood not in the *dedication* or consecration of them by men, but in the *acceptation* of them as his, and so holy, by God himselfe, both allowing them so to doe, and giving lawes to receive and order them. Which without those lawes, had beene will-worship, and so not acceptable unto God. For which end God had a Treasurie appointed to receive things thus offered, as his.

3. It is now in the time of the Gospell, lawfull for men to *devote* things, to pious (as well as to charitable) uses. But with much difference from those times of the law. 1. That then, the things were *immediately devoted* unto God; now *mediately* by men: For they are given, suppose, to such a Church, such a Parish, or such a Minister, for their ease of charge, for their maintenance, &c. and so doe remotely, & at last redound to the honor of God, (as also things given to charitable uses doe) but not immediately and nextly as those free-will offerings in the time of the law, did. 2. Then it was *actus Religionis*, & a part of worship, now it is *actus religiosus*, or *hominis religiosi*, not *Religionis*; and rather *actus pij affectus* than *pietatis*. And though the keeping of that promise or vow, to *devote* such a thing to pious uses, was to him that made it, an act of Religion, as a promise made to God: yet, neither was the making of that promise, any act of Religion *properly*, or any part of worship, nor the *thing* by promise *devoted*, any part of worship. And 3. Then it was utterly unlawfull, not onely for the persons *devoting*, without leave, but for any other person, private or publick, to alienate the *thing devoted* unto God: but now, though it cannot be alienated by the person *devoting*, yet the State, upon sufficient reasons, may alienate it, which appeares by that law of our land, that if any man *devote* any land to the Church, without the leave and allowance of Parliament, after the Incumbents death, it becomes a Mort, and falls into the hands of the King: which could not be done, without Sacriledge, if the private *dedica-*

tion did give God such *propriety* in the thing, that it so became Gods, that it was no longer mans. Now from hence wee may conclude, that the *dedication* or consecration of any thing by men, doth not make it so peculiarly to be Gods, that it is no longer ours: which may thus be cleared. First, God hath now no standing Treasurie to receive such things, erected in the New Testament, as he had in the Temple of old. 2. He hath not commanded, nor that I find allowed, any *dedication* of any thing to him *immediatly*. For though a private man may give a Cup to be used in the Sacrament, a Cushion, Table-cloath, &c. which he cannot, as a private man, alienate: yet in propriety of speech, I denie it to be given *immediatly to God*, * but rather *to the Parish*: And though they may not, needlesly aliene, or alter that gift, yet if it be battered and unserviceable, they may: and the new one needs not be made of the same Individuall silver, nor just of that value, and proportion. 3. This argument is to mee unanswerable. If it be not in the power of men, to make any thing a part of worship, then it is not in the power of *humane consecration*, to give God such *propriety* in the thing *dedicated*, that it becomes so his, and is no longer ours; the reason of the sequell is, because that is to make it a part of worship. But the Antecedent is most true, by the second commandement. It belongs to God onely to prescribe the parts and particulars of his owne worship. *Ergo*. But more of this againe anon. Wee goe on.

Proofes.

...y said of ... Centuri- ... He hath ...t *us* a Sy- ...ogue: not ... *God*, or *to* ...*d*, and *his* ...*me*, as *Salo-* ...*n* sayes of ... Temple. ...King. 8. 13. ...20, &c.

Of this holinesse, any thing is capable, that is capable of peculiar relation unto God; persons, places, times, and things, As Temples and Churches, in which (N.B.) *both these relations concurre, of divine presence, and divine propriety. For it is both Gods house, as dedicated to his name, And the place also wherein God is wont to be present with them, in his word and Sacraments:* Tempora Sacra, *as the Lords day, and other Holy and Festivall times:* Personæ Sacræ, *as Priests and Clergie, &c,*

But to this wee say, First, hee confounds things that differ very much, in regard of holinesse: as the *Lords dayes*, with other *Festivalls*: the *Ministers* & *Temple* with *Churches*; the one sort whereof are *properly holy*, by *divine institution*, the other *improperly*, by *humane consecration*, 2. Hee is as indistinct in application of his Relative Holinesse unto Churches. For neither doth hee distinguish of Gods *presence* there, nor yet of *dedication*, whether he meane, *divine*,

or

or *humane* consecration: If hee think that Gods *spirituall presence* makes the Church to be *holy*, it is denied; unlesse he will yeeld, that where ever God is *spiritually present*, the place is presently made *holy*; and that, not onely during the time of the ordinances, his word and Sacraments, but also *extra usum*, which he intends, as we shall perceive afterwards; If he meane *humane dedication*, it is also denied, that this doth so make the places to be *holy*, that they become so Gods, that they are no longer ours. This, wee take it, is the difference betweene the *Temple*, and our *Churches*, in regard of Holinesse: That the one was not onely *consecrated by God*, but also made the place of his *Symbolicall presence*, whereas ours are *consecrated by men*, without command, that we know of; and he is only *spirituall* present there: and consequently the former was *properly holy*, with relation to Gods, both *consecration* and *presence*; the latter onely *improperly*, with respect to the *holy duties* there performed. And therefore we may truly say, This Holinesse had place under the Law, but not under the Gospell: which thus hee replyes upon.

If any shall except, that in the Old Testament indeed, this holinesse had place, but in the New, there is no such thing, I would encounter him thus. If any place under the Gospell may be more peculiarly the place of divine presence than every place: If any thing in the Gospell may be more peculiarly Gods, than every thing, then such holinesse hath place in the New Testament as well as in the Old, Sed verum prius. *Ergo.*

In answer whereunto, we must first distinguish of *divine presence* as afore; It is *sensible*, *symbolicall*, and *spirituall*. The two first are not to be found in our *Churches*: For neither did God ever *sensibly* appear in our *Churches*, as to *Moses* in the Bush; and if he had, it had made them onely holy for that time of apparition, which will not serve his turne. Nor is there in our *Churches*, any standing *symbole* of his *presence*, as was in the old *Temple*, which made it *properly holy*. And as for his *spirituall presence*, as it is there, onely during the time of the holy assemblies, and ordinances there administred; so it makes not the place holy, if at all, longer than the time of those performances; which will stand him in little steed, to his maine purpose; which is, to prove *holinesse* there, *extra usum*, when there is no publick worship. Yet he proceeds.

By this, you may judge, what to think of Doct. Burgesse his assertion, That Temples were holy, only in the holy use of them. If his meaning be, they are holy no longer, than during such use; would hee say, that Ministers are sacred persons, onely while they are officiating in preaching &c. and at other times differing nothing from Lay-men? would he say, the Lords day is holy onely for the time that divine service continues, and no longer? Par enim est ratio. I confesse I heard one not long since preach so; But he was not aware, that by this assertion, he blew up the foundation of his owne Tenet, concerning the reverence due to Churches and Altars, &c.

To this we say these things. First, there are some who will not yeeld so much, as *D. B.* doth: that Churches are holy even in the use. And that not without probable reasons at least. 1. It is not found in the New Testament, that ever the places of Christian assemblies are called Holy. 2. They are perswaded, that the spirituall presence of God makes no place holy, nor ever did, no not in the old Testament. 3. Nor (say they) hath the Place any influence at all into the Religious Duties (which it should have, if it were, in proper phrase, to be stiled holy, even during the use thereof) but is only a physicall Adjunct of the Duties, and at most, but helpfull to the bodies conveniences. Let these things be considered; and we add,

Secondly, he againe confounds things that differ much: persons and Time consecrated by God, and places consecrated by men: The former are sacred, *extra usum*, so are not the latter, for ought hee hath said.

Thirdly, he could not but know, that there were many, beside the man whom hee heard preach, that hold, that the Lords day is holy, no longer than the publick divine service continues, who, (as he truly sayes) are not aware, that by this assertion they blow up the foundation of their owne Tenet, concerning the Holinesse of Churches, *extra usum publicum*, and the Reverence due to them and Altars, at all times, when there is no publick worship. But it is just with God to infatuate men, and confound their tongues against their owne opinions: For I have often wondered, how men should be so injurious, as to deny the Lords Day to be wholy Holy, and so to be observed, in private as well as publick, and yet to affirme, that the Church is Holy alwayes, when there is no publick worship: *par enim est ratio*, sayes our Author: If any say, the reason of the former is, because they hold the Lords day to be onely an Ecclesiasticall

sticall institution: the same may be said much more of the latter; For Churches are, without all doubt, but of humane consecration; but the Lords day is by many learned Divines maintained to be of Divine institution. And seeing this Author seemes here to be of this opinion, he might easily have seene the difference, that there is not *par ratio*, in things consecrated by God, and those which are consecrated by men: Or if he think, the Lords Day to be of Ecclesiasticall constitution too, as * after he seemes to doe, he also blowes up the foundation of his owne present Tenet, concerning Holinesse in Churches, *extra usum*, as well as the Preacher did: unlesse hee can give us some better satisfaction, which thus he offers to doe.

* *Sect.* 3. The practice of the Church in hallowing every first day of the week, &c.

I would desire you to consider well this proposition, That a place may be said to be Holy, in relation to divine presence, not onely where God is in such manner present actually, but where he is wont to be, yea or had wont to be. Therefore Daniel *prayed towards Jerusalem, when the Temple was defaced, and burnt, and the Ark of the covenant was gone. Yea even there, where he hath once beene, in some illustrious and extraordinary manner. Witnesse mount Tabor, which onely for the glorious transfiguration of Christ thereon, having never had any other divine relation, is by S.* Peter, 2 Pet. 1. 18. *termed the holy Mount. Be it so, that the Sacraments are no longer Sacraments, than in the use of them, yet are they holy, as long as they are for that use.*

Here are many things lyable to just exceptions. First, if this proposition might passe, the day were his. But I pray consider, how he beggs the question, and steales upon us, to grant him what hee cannot prove, that a place is truly said, not to have beene, but to be holy, when God is not actually present: which is most false, both in respect of the sensible presence, for the bush was not holy, after that apparation, and also in respect of the Symbolicall presence, for the place of the Temple was not holy, *after the Ark and Altar was quite gone*, and the typicall use expired; And as for the spirituall presence, it doth not make the place holy, when actually exhibited, much lesse, after it is ended, for then more places than the Church should be holy, where God hath bin actually, but spiritually present, which I think he would not have granted. God was wont to be present, actually, and Symbolically in the Temple, in Jerusalem; therefore those places may be said, to have bin holy, but to say they are still holy, and more holy than other places, is Popish Superstition.

Secondly, his proofe is not sufficient. For *Daniel* had another ground for what he did in praying towards the Temple, *viz.* a promise (which was to last till Christ came, who was typified by the Temple) that if any did pray towards that house, in any place of the world, God would heare in heaven, 1 *King.* 8. But if this Authour, while he lived, or any now should pray towards the Temple of *Ierusalem*, or any Church of ours, with respect of more holinesse there, the world would laugh at his superstitious folly, yet certainly God had wont to be present in the Temple.

Thirdly, the like may be said for Mount Tabor; St. *Peter* calls it the holy Mount, not because it was so then when hee writ, but because it was so during the Transfiguration; as if one speaking of the bush, or the Temple, should call them the holy Bush, or the holy Temple. Or if he thinke it was holy in St. *Peters* time, let him tell us whether it be so still, or when it ceased so to be.

Lastly, his conclusion spoiles his project. Bee it so (sayes he) that Sacraments are no longer Sacraments, than in the use of them; yet are they holy, as long as they are for that use: But first, the difference betweene the Sacraments, or Sacramentall elements, and the Church, is manifest, the one are consecrated by Gods institution, the other by men. Next, the Application must be this; So churches at most are but holy in their use (for so are the Sacramentals) during the time of the holy imployments; but after that returne to be as other places, for so the Sacramentalls doe, after their use, returne to be common, though properly holy in their use by divine institution, and divine presence with his owne ordinances, which cannot so well be said of Churches. Vnlesse therefore he can prove some other presence of God in the Church than spirituall, namely Symbolicall, he cannot for ought I see prove that there is any Holines in Churches, *extra usum publicum*, if at all: And this he seems to undertake to doe, in that which followes.

Sect. II.

Whether the holy Table may be rightly called *Solium Christi.*

I expected no scruple at that speech. For if the holy Table be sedes corporis & sanguinis Christi, *why not* solium Christi? *What is* solium, *but* sedes, nempe Regia: *And is not the body of Christ* βασιλικὸν σῶμα? *Hence Antiquitie called the holy Table,* ἅγιον ἁγίων, *and the place where it stood* ἀνάκτορον. Euseb. hist. eccl. l. 10. c. 4. Theodor.

odot. lib. 1. c. 17. *These two places I thought not unfit to cite, that it might appeare, how farre the conceits of the Ancients, and ours differ in this point.*

Any sober conscience might well scruple that speech, which at best, is most improper, at worst, scandalous and offensive, if not superstitious and idolatrous. For first, the Table is not properly *sedes corporis*, &c. but as it is the place of the Sacramentall elements, and they are more likely to be *sedes corporis*, &c. yet they are improperly so called, for they are not *sedes*, but *Signa*, signes Sacramental and figurative. 2. Christs body is indeed βασιλικὸν σῶμα, But I pray, is Christs body properly upon the Table at any time? Heaven is my throne, is here applyable, so is not the Table. 3. But if he take it properly, it is not onely scandalous but Idolatrous, and savours strongly of Romish Transubstantiation: the Bread and Wine being in their opinion turned into the very body and bloud of Christ, no marvell if they say, the Altar is *solium Christi*. 4. They much mistake the matter: For Christ is not represented in the Sacrament upon the Table, as in his Majestie, but rather as in his lowest humilitie, and humiliation; and therefore the Table is most improperly called his Throne; rather representing his Crosse whereon hee was crucified, than his Throne whereon hee sits as glorified. Lastly, those hyperbolicall expressions, and wanton metaphors of the Ancients, have (unawares to them good men) filled the Church with superstition. It matters not therefore how neere the Ancients and ours doe come in their expressions, but how neere they come to the truth, and holy Scriptures, which never speake in such a language.

SECT. III.

How, in the New Testament, God or Christ can be said to have his Throne or place of presence in our Churches, when they are not by divine (as were the Tab. and Temple) but humane appointment, and without any such Symbolum, *as the Arke there was.*

I answer; To erect or set apart a place for Divine worship, and the exercise of the rites of Religion, is juris naturæ, *and approved by God from the beginning; It began not with the Tabernacle or Temple, made by Gods speciall appointment to* Moses. Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, *erected places of Divine worship wheresoever they came, without any speciall appointment from God, &c.* This

This ſhall quickly be diſpatched. That convenient places (in times of peace) ſhould be ſet apart, for the decent and orderly performance of Gods ſervice, ſeemes to be a dictate of nature; but that thoſe places ſhould ever after be holy, even *extra uſum publicum*, and made the Thrones and places of Gods ſpeciall preſence, when there is no publick worſhip there, is not yet proved. Yet thus hee goes about it.

For the nature of thoſe places, wee can no where learne it better, than from that of the Lord to Moſes, *Exod.* 20. *immediatly after he had pronounced the Decalogue, where premiſing that they ſhould not make with him, Gods of ſilver,* &c. *he addes, In all places where I record my name, I will come unto thee. Here is contained the definition of a place ſet apart for Divine worſhip; It is the place where God records his Name, and communicates to men to bleſſe them. The memoriall of Gods Name is any Symboll or token, wherby he teſtifies his Covenant, and as it were commerceth with men.— Now I aske, did not Chriſt ordaine the holy Euchariſt, to be the memoriall of his Name, in the New* Teſtament? *Doe this, ſaith he, in remembrance of me. And there be thoſe that will not ſticke to ſay, that Chriſt is as much preſent here, as the Lord was upon the Mercy-Seat, betweene the Cherubins. Why ſhould not then the places appointed for the ſtation of his memoriall under the Goſpell, have ſome ſemblable Sanctitie to that of old?*

To this I anſwer; First, the deſcription and definition is extended here too far, For they are intended onely of ſuch places, as are by God himſelfe ſet apart for his worſhip, with reſpect eſpecially to the Tabernacle and Temple, though neither of them as yet erected. In the places where I ſhall place the memoriall of my Name: not in all places that men ſhall ſet apart. But God hath not ſet apart any place in the New Teſtament, where to record his Name. The promiſe of Gods cõming unto them, and bleſſing them, was made not only to the ſacrifices and ſervices, but to the very places: but now God hath not made any ſuch promiſe to any place, but to the duties whereſoever performed, and the perſons whereſoever aſſembled. Where ever two or three are gathered together in my Name, there I will be in the midſt of them. And therefore the caſes are not alike. 2. The Euchariſt indeed is appointed to be celebrated, for a memoriall of Chriſts death; but that, as at firſt it was done in a common roome, as is confeſſed hereafter, ſo it may be done in any place fit

and

and convenient, which the Sacrifices of old might not: and that's another difference. 3. Though the Sacramentall elements be Symboles or tokens, whereby he testifies his Covenant; yet so is not the Church or *Table*; Therefore all that can bee said, is but this, That the Sacrament hath semblable sanctitie, to those of old, and that the Sacramental elements are the Throne, or place of spiritual presence; where ever the Sacrament is administred; but still with this difference, that this memoriall is not alwayes present on the *Table*, as at least some of those were in the Law, and therefore the *Table* can at most be said to be holy, and the place of Presence, but onely during the time of Administration of the Sacrament, which will not doe him service enough, to prove the places holy, when there is no publick worship. Yet something he sayes to this.

You will say, This Christian memoriall is not alwayes there present, as at least some one or other of those in the Law were. I answer, it is enough, it is wont to bee. As the Chaire of estate loses not his relation and due respect, though the King be not alwayes there And remember, that the Arke of the Covenant was not in Jerusalem, *when* Daniel *opened his windowes, and prayed thitherwards, and was wanting all the time of the second Temple.*

This is sufficiently answered before; For first, it is not sufficient to make a place perpetually holy, that God was wont to be present there; And then, Gods spirituall presence (which onely is now in the Sacrament) never made any place holy. But we adde, 1. By the same reason he may conclude, that the *Font* or *Pulpit* are Gods Throne and place of presence, and alike holy with the *Table*, because God is wont to bee present there. 2. The similitude of the Chaire of estate will not hold in matter of divine worship. Men may put what relations and respects they please; but no man can put a proper Relative holinesse upon a place, but onely God himselfe. If he command a place to bee set apart, as a place of memoriall of his Name, that is sufficient to make it perpetually holy during his pleasure; but no such command is now extant in the Gospell; and that's a reall difference: For so he sayes.

Doth any Chaire of state retaine any respect, if the King bee not actually present in the House?

You will say, In the Old Testament these things were appointed and commanded by the Law; In the New we find no such thing. I answer, In things for which we find no new Rule given in the New Testament, there we are referred to the Analogie of the old: Witnesse the Apostles proofes taken thence for the maintenance of the ministry, 1 Cor. 9. 13. And the practice of the Church, in Baptizing

Infants, from analogie of Circumciſion: In hallowing every firſt day of the weeke, as one in ſeven, from the Analogie of the Iewes Sabbath, &c.

But to this, I ſay, Firſt this is a dangerous Rule to goe by, eſpecially in the ſervice of God; for thus we might revive a great part of the Ceremoniall Law, and ſome have done it in ſome particulars. 2. The things inſtanced in, are not grounded meerely upon Analogie of the Old Teſtament, but are fairely deduced from grounds of Scripture; As *Pad baptiſme* from divers places of the New Teſtament, *Marc.* 10. *Act.* 2. The obſervation of the firſt day of every weeke, hath the fourth Commandement for the generall ground of it, as one in ſeven, and the Apoſtles deſignation, as the firſt day of the weeke: And as for the maintenance of the Miniſtrie, how ever the Apoſtle alludes to the Old Teſtament, yet it is expreſſely commanded in the New; God hath ordained, that they which preach the Goſpell, ſhould live of the Goſpell: And, let him that is taught, make him that teacheth him partaker of all his goods, *Gal.* 6. which is more by farre than Analogie of the Old Teſtament.

Sect. IIII.

Why in the poſture of our adoration of the divine Majeſtie, more reſpect ſhould be had to the Altar, or holy Table, *than either to the Font or Pulpit, ſeeing they are places of Gods preſence, as well as the other.*

Suppoſe they be ſo, yet when there are many, why ſhould not that which is principall draw this reſpect unto it? A man is preſent where any part of him is, yet when we ſalute him, or ſpeake unto him, wee are wont to direct our ſelves unto his face, as that wherein his preſence is principally exerted, not to his backer parts, &c. *perhaps it was this principally, which the Doctor intended, when he ſaid,* That, Hoc eſt corpus meum, *was more with him, than* hoc eſt verbum meum.

This may thus be anſwered. Firſt, it is a meere begging of the queſtion, that one place in the Church is more principall than another: and that God is more preſent at the Table, when there is no Sacrament there, than at the Font or Pulpit, when thoſe ſervices are in act, for ſo he muſt aſſert it, or it is not to the purpoſe: wee ſay, God is no more preſent at one place than another, which yet he ſuppoſes, by the ſimilitude of a mans face: Gods face is ſeene as much in

in one ordinance as in another. 2. The preſence of God, is not now Symbolicall, as of old in the Temple, more exhibited in one place than another, which was therefore called the Face and preſence of God, but onely ſpirituall, and that equally in all his holy ordinances; and ſo doth not make one place more principall, or more holy than another; and ſo no reaſon for our adoration to be directed to one place more than to another. 3 He that ſaid, *Hoc eſt corpus meum*, was more with him, than *hoc ſt verbum meum*, ſaid (as I ſuppoſe) he knew not what. For firſt God is as ſpiritually preſent with his Word, as with his Sacrament. 2. It is *hoc eſt verbum meum*, that makes it *corpus meum*: *Accedat verbum*, &c. *& fit Sacramentum.* But theſe compariſons are fanties of men, without any ground of Scripture; and if there be any principalitie amongſt them, the Word may ſeeme to have the preheminence. But he ſayes,

I thinke, for my part, firſt that the compariſon of the Pulpit with the Sacraments, and their places, is here too generall. Secondly, that neither the Pulpit, nor the Font, are in this point, or for this purpoſe wee ſpeake of, of the ſame nature with the Altar. For it ought to bee conſidered (though it bee a thing now adayes quite forgotten) that the Euchariſt, according to the meaning of the Inſtitution, is the Rite of our addreſſe unto God the Father, in the New Teſtament, wherewith we come before him to offer unto his divine Majeſtie, our thankeſgiving, ſupplications, and praiſes, in the name of his Son Ieſus Chriſt crucified for us; that is, it is not onely a Sacrament, but as the ancient Church uſed to ſpeake, a Sacrifice alſo. For that Sacrifices were Rites wherby they invocated and called upon God, is a truth undeniable, &c.

To this I anſwer; Firſt, how the compariſon of the one with the other is too generall, I underſtand not. But the compariſon is ill laid, as I conceive. For it ſhould not be made betweene the *Pulpit* and the *Sacraments*; but (if he will needs be making compariſons) either betweene the *Pulpit*, *Font*, and *Table*, or betweene *Preaching*, *Baptiſme*, and the *Euchariſt*: And conſideration ſhould bee had in what ſenſe the compariſon is made, whether he meane in the *poſture* of our *Adoration*, more reſpect ſhould be had to the *Altar* or *Table*, than to the *Font* or *Pulpit*, when the particular ordinances are actually performed, or when there are none of the ordinances actually in being. And in both conſiderations, I conceive they are equall, and there need be no compariſon. For we have ſaid afore, that to direct our *poſture* or face *towards* the place where any *ordinance* is in *act*, ſeemes very reaſonable, as tending much to edification, not with re-

spect to the place as *more holy*, &c. but to the *ordinance* there in being. But to have respect to one place more than another as more *holy*, or God *more present there*, when no ordinance is there, is justly suspected as superstitious. But let us consider his reason of the difference.

The Eucharist (sayes he) is the Rite of our addresse to God the Father, *&c.* wherewith we come before him to offer, *&c.* that is, it is not onely a *Sacrament*, but a *Sacrifice*. And Sacrifices of old, were Rites of invocation. To which I say: 1. That Sacrifices of old, were Rites of Invocation, is a truth vulgarly knowne, but hee must not begge the question and say, the *Eucharist* is such a *Sacrifice*, *properly* so called; though the ancient Church were pleased so to call it. 2. Nor may he thinke to delude us by this consequence. In the Eucharist, we represent the death of Christ to God his Father, and beseech him, to be propitious unto us for his sake; therefore the *Eucharist* is a *proper Sacrifice*. For in the administration of *Baptisme*, in our publike and private *Invocations* and prayers, wee doe represent the death of Christ to his Father, and desire him for his sake, to bee propitious to us, yet is not there any *proper sacrifice*. And this is that which Mr. *Perkins*, by him cited, saies: The ancient Fathers used to call the Supper of the Lord, or the *whole action* of the *Supper*, a *Sacrifice*, as for other causes, so for this; *By a Metonymie, because it is a commemoration, and also a representation unto God the Father, of the Sacrifice of Christ offered upon the Crosse. But* (sayes he) *this oblation is intentionall, not reall; And in this sense* (note it) *the faithfull in their prayers, doe offer Christ as a Sacrifice for their sins, in being wholly carried away in their minds and affections, unto that onely and true Sacrifice, to procure and obtaine Gods great favour unto them.* Where note, that this learned man sayes, They called it a *Sacrifice* by a Metonymie, not a *proper Sacrifice*, as some now call it: and then hee sayes, that all the faithfull offer this *Sacrifice*, not onely in the *Eucharist*, but in their *private prayers*, intentionally, not really, and so are spirituall Priests; which marres their plot of a proper *Sacrifice*, and a proper *Priest* and proper *Altar*, which yet they plead for. Let us heare how he applyes, that he hath said to his purpose, to answer the doubt propounded.

Perk. Tom. 1. 551. c. 1.

These premises considered, the answer to your demand, why in the posture of our adoration of the divine Majestie, more respect should be had to the Altar, &c. is plaine and easie, namely, because adoration is an act of addresse and of tender of honour unto God, and therefore

most

moſt fitly to be performed, at or toward the place of our addreſſe, which is the Altar, &c. The Pulpit is the place where God ſpeakes to us, not we to him: The Font the place where he reacheth his favour unto us, in accepting us to be his ſervants, not where being initiated, we offer our ſpirituall ſervice and ſacrifice unto him.

But this is little to his purpoſe, and little ſatisfaction of the doubt: For firſt; *Invocation* is an act of addreſſe to God, made in the reading Pew or *Pulpit*, and therefore, by the ſame reaſon, our adoration moſt fitly to be performed at or towards thoſe places of our addreſſe. Secondly, the *Pulpit* is a place, where, not onely God ſpeaks to us, but we alſo ſpeak to him; The *Font* alſo, a place, where, not onely God reacheth his favour to us, but wee alſo ſpeak to him, and offer up our prayers, and repreſent that very *Sacrifice* of Chriſts death upon the Croſſe to his Father, (*Water* ſignifying and repreſenting the *blood* of Chriſt, as well as the *wine* in the other Sacrament.) Laſtly, the *table* alſo, is a place, where God reaches out his favour unto us, tendring and giving us the *body* and *blood* of his Sonne, repreſented in the *bread* and *wine*: And therefore, there being little or no difference betweene the places, there is little or no reaſon given, why in the poſture of our adoration, more reſpect ſhould be had to the *Table*, than to the *Font* or *Pulpit*, eſpecially conſidering, that they are places of Gods preſence, as well as the other, and (for ought appeares) as much; ſeeing God is ſpiritually onely preſent, in all the places. But for a concluſion, wee ſay, all that long diſcourſe of his being granted, yet he cannot conclude the point in queſtion. For,

1. This is no good conſequence: *Sacrifices* are Rites of invocation (and the *Euchariſt* is called by the Ancients, a *Sacrifice*) *ergo*, in our poſture of adoration, more reſpect is to be had to the *Altar*, &c. For in the *Temple*, in the poſture of their adoration, more reſpect was had to the *Ark*, than to the *Altar* of burnt offerings.

2. Nor is this any better: The *Euchariſt* is the principall Rite of our Addreſſe to God, *ergo*, in the poſture of our adoration, more reſpect is to be had to the *Altar* (ſo called) than to the *Font* or *Pulpit*: For the moſt that can be concluded, is but this, that more reſpect is to be had to the *Euchariſt* or *Sacramentall elements*, than to the *Font* or *Pulpit*, or to the *water*, in the one, and *word* in the other. But for my part, I ſhould hate ſuch compariſons: And what is this to the places themſelves, when there is no ordinance there in being, unleſſe we ſay, that the more principall *Rite*, gives more *Holineſſe*

to the place, or hath God more present, at all times, than other Rites and Ordinances doe; which we suppose to be a superstitious and groundlesse conceit, without any proofe or allowance of Scripture; yet he adds.

Whereas you seeme to question, whether the Jewes had any such respect unto the Altar of burnt offering: I answer, they had; for it was so placed, that when they turned and worshipped towards the Mercy seat, they worshipped towards it also, but the denominatum *of their posture is from the Arke, as the principall memoriall of the divine presence, yet sometimes from the Altar also, as* 1 King. 8 22 31. 2 Chro. 6.13. *&c. But the Altar of Incense better befits our holy Table, than the Altar of burnt offering: though it may truly be affirmed, if rightly taken, that the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ is to us Christians, both* Arca fœderis, Incensum, *and* Holocaustum, *being the commemoration of him, which is all these to us.*

To this we say. 1. The placing of it so, argues not, that they had such respect unto it: as a man praying in his seat, before the *Altar* now, as they call it, doth it not with any respect to the seate before him, betweene himselfe and the *Altar*. 2. But were it granted, it profits him nothing, because the *Altar* was a Type of Christ, and of Gods owne institution, and so a part of worship, none of all which can truly be said, of their *Altar* now. 3. If there be a *commemoration sacrifice*, as some speake, and a representation of the death and sacrifice of Christ upon the Crosse, it may seeme, that the Altar of burnt offerings, better befits our holy Table, than that of Incense; and the Table of Shewbread better than either; but all of them improperly. 4. The Sacrament of the body and blood, may be affirmed to be to us Christians, all those above specified, but figuratively, not properly; being indeed the commemoration of him, who is all those to us: but then there is no necessity of a proper *Altar*, proper *sacrifice*, or proper *Priest*: and still the respect, in our posture of adoration, is not had to the *Altar* or holy *Table*, but rather to the *Sacrament*, as a Rite of Christs owne institution; or, which is best and fittest to be said, to Christ himselfe, in the use of his own ordinance. And so, no respect at all is to be had, more to the Table, than to the Font, or Pulpit, when there is no ordinance in being. And with this I rest.

FINIS.

402950